

B 3793

A

TREATISE
OF
COMMUNION
UNDER
Both Kinds.

By the Reverend Father in God, the
Lord *James Benigne Bossuet* Bishop of
Meaux, Councillor to the King, &c.

Faithfully Render'd from the French.

with Allowance.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Matthew Turner* at the Lamb
in *High-Holbourn*, 1687.

A
TREATISE

OF

COMMON

UNDER

Both Kinds.

By the Reverend Father in God, the
Lord, James Bevelin, Bishop of
Exeter, Comendator of the King's

the Bishop of Exeter, the King's

JOHN GUYARD

LONDON

Printed for Matthew Turner at the Lamb
in High Street 1687

TO THE
HONOURABLE
THOMAS Lord PETRE
BARON
OF
WRITTLE.

Right Honourable.

TH O' the Consideration of that
Rank of Honour, wherein your
Lordship stands, might justly
discourage me from making my Address at
this time to your Lordship; yet on the
other

The Epistle Dedicatory.

other side, your Lordship's innate Goodness, and wonderful Clemency, together with the Dignity of the Matter, have prevail'd with me to Consecrate these my small Endeavours to your Lordship, as a Testimony of my Gratitude. The Subject is great, and at this time highly necessary; It is Religion, the Author is altogether Venerable; both equally Challenge an admittance into your Lordships Closet. To insert here the just Praises of this mighty Prelate would make this Epistle bigger than the Book. In short, he is one of the greatest Champions Holy Church hath had in this Age, whether you respect his exemplary Life, or the frequent Victories of his Triumphant Pen. For as I humbly conceive there are two ordinary ways of Propagating

The Epistle Dedicatory.

gating and Recommending Truth to the World, which are writing well, and living well, or Reason and Example. Our Author hath been eminent in both: In the latter (which generally Proves the most successful) your Lordship may justly challenge a place even amongst the formost; I mean, that powerful, yet silent way of propagating Truth; good Example, whose Beauty and Force lie not in the just Cadence of well-tun'd Words, or in the turn of Periods, but in a continued Series of pious and charitable Actions. This is in effect what the Holy Ghost insinuates to all the mighty and generous Followers of Holy Jesus, in these Words: *Let your Light so shine before Men, that they seeing your good Works, may glorify your Father which is in Heaven.* And this is what
your

The Epistle Dedicatory.

your Lordship seems to copy, whilst by your repeated Charity you invincibly shew, the true design of Greatness, is not so much to glitter and amaze the World, as to benefit, and enlighten it at the same time. Thus humbly craving your Lordships Pardon, for my Presumption at this time, and heartily praying for your Lordships Health and eternal Happiness, I am

Your Lordship's

Most humble

and most devoted

Jo. Davis.

A T A B L E OF THE ARTICLES Contained in this Treatise.

THE FIRST PART.

The Practice and Judgment of the Church
from the first Ages.

S E C T I.

THE Practice and Judgment of the Primitive
Church in this Point. p. 2

I I.

Four authentick Customs to shew the Judgment of
the Primitive Church. p. 4

First Custom. The Communion of the Sick, Ibid.

I I I.

Second Custom. Communion of little Infants. p. 22

I V.

Third Custom. Domestick, or Private Communion. p. 31

V.

Fourth Custom. Communion at the Church, and at
the ordinary Office. p. 39

V I.

The Mass of Holy Friday, and that of the Pre-
sanctified. p. 43

V I I.

The Sentiments and Practice of these last Ages grounded
on the Sentiments and Practice of the Primitive
Church. p. 52

T H E

THE SECOND PART.

Principles on which the Practice, and Judgment of the Church are established; which also the Protestants make use of as well as we.

I.

First Principle. *Nothing indispensable in the Sacrament but what is essential.* p. 56

II.

Second Principle. *To know what is the Essence of a Sacrament, we must know the essential Effects thereof.*

III.

p. 54

The Pretended Reformers agree with us in this Principle, and have no other Foundation for their Discipline.

Mr. Jurieux's Doctrine examin'd in his Book call'd Le Preservatif, &c. IV. p. 58

Third Principle. *Constant and Perpetual Practice is the best Comment on the Law. An Exposition of this Principle by an Example of the Civil Law.* p. 62

V.

A Proof from the Observances of the Old Testament.

VI.

p. 66

A Proof from the Observances of the New Testament.

VII.

p. 72

Communion under one Kind establish'd without Contradiction. VIII. p. 83

Mr. Jurieux's History of the taking away of the Cup, Refuted. IX. p. 89

A Reflection on the Doctrine of Concomitancy, and the sixth Chapter of the Gospel of St. John. p. 97

X.

Some Objections answered by the precedent Doctrine.

XI.

p. 102

A Reflexion on the manner how the Pretended Reformers make use of Scripture. XII. p. 106

Some incident Difficulties: frivolous and idle Subtilties of the Calvinists, and particularly of Mr. Jurieux: The judgment of Antiquity concerning Concomitancy; Veneration and Respect exhibited to Jesus Christ in the Eucharist: The Doctrine of this Treatise confirmed. p. 108

A

A
TREATISE
OF THE
HOLY COMMUNION
UNDER
Both Kinds.

*A Division of the following Discourse into
two Parts.*

THE Controverſie of Communion under both Kinds (notwithſtanding all that may be urged by thoſe of the *Pretended Reformation*) in appearance hath but one difficulty ; and that too, as eaſily to be ſolved, or cleared by the conſtant practice of *Holy Church*, as by the very Principles of its Adverſaries, the *Pretended Reformers*.

I ſhall therefore in this Diſcourſe explain, 1. The foreſaid Practice of *Holy Church*. 2. The Principles which ſupport

that Practice. Thus shall I firmly establish what I lay down, since, as on one side the matter of Fact will appear evident to all; so also will the Grounds on which it is built.

THE FIRST PART.

SECT. I.

The Practice and Judgment of the Primitive Church in this Point.

*The Pra-
ctice ex-
plained.*

Communion under one, or both Kinds, was the Practice of the *Primitive Church*, and that too indifferently, without the least imagination of any defect in Communion under one Kind.

Luk. xii.
v. 20.
1 Cor. xi.
v. 25.

It was never so much as dreamt of, That the Grace annexed to the Sacred Body of our Lord, was any ways distinct from that which belonged to his Blood. He gave his Body before he gave his Blood; and we may conclude from the Words of St. Luke and St. Paul, that he gave his Body when at Supper, and his Blood after; so that there was a considerable interval betwixt the two Actions. Did he suspend the Grace or spiritual Effects of his Body, till the Apostles had received his Blood? or when they received his Body, did they receive the Grace which is annexed to it (*viz.*) that of being incorporated into Jesus Christ, and being nourished with his Substance? Without doubt they did. Besides, the receiving of his Blood is neither necessary for the obtaining the Grace or Benefit of this blessed Sacrament; or for the foundation of this holy Mystery: The Substance is entirely contained under one Kind; and each Kind by it self, and both together contain the same Source or Fountain of Grace and Sanctification. St. Paul manifestly supposeth this Doctrine, when he writeth, That he who *eatech this Bread, or drinketh the Cup of our Lord unworthily, is guilty of the*

1 Cor. xi.
v. 27.

S E C T. II.

*Four Authentick Customs to shew the Judgment
of the Primitive Church.*

THere are four Authentick Customs of the *Primitive Church*, which demonstrate this Truth : And the Practice of them hath been so constant ; and on the other side the Opposition of the *Reformed* in this Point so frivolous, and contradictory, that what they seem to oppugne or destroy, they rather Confirm beyond all doubt.

FIRST CUSTOM.

The Communion of the Sick.

I Find the receiving, under one kind was practised in the Communion of the Sick, in the Communion of Infants, in the private and domestick Communion of the Faithful, when they carried the Blessed Sacrament home to their own Houses, and that which will more surprize our Reformers, I find it also in the more publick and solemn Communion of the *Primitive Church*.

I confess, this so important and decisive Matter of Fact hath been handled before ; but perhaps the vain and frivolous Subtilties of the Ministers have not been thoroughly sifted in this point. God grant by his Grace that I may so do it, that not only these Matters of Antiquity may be cleared, but also that the Triumph of Truth in this point may be manifested to the Christian World.

The first Matter of Fact which I lay down, is this, That the Communion of the Sick was administered usually under one kind, and that of Bread too. The *Species* of Wine being

more

more subject to Corruption, could not be kept so well, nor so easily or conveniently ; our Blessed Saviour intending nothing extraordinary to our Senes in this great Mystery of Faith. It would also have been too apt to have been spilt, especially in the carrying it to several Persons at great distance ; and that too, not without great Danger and Inconvenience, in times of Persecution. Holy Church (the ever careful and tender Mother of the Faithful) was willing both to facilitate the Communion of the Sick, and to avoid the danger of effusion or shedding the sacred Mystery, which never happened, or was never seen without Horror or Confusion, as you may gather by what follows.

The Example of *Serapion* in the Church History sufficiently sheweth what the Practice in this Point was in relation to the Sick: He was in the State of Repentance or performing his Penance: But as the Holy *Eucharist* was not denied to such in danger of Life, *Serapion* finding himself in danger, sent for the Holy *Viaticum*. The Priest, who could not bring it himself, gave a little Piece of the *Eucharist* to a Youth, ordering him first to dip it or moisten it in something liquid, and so to give it the good old Man. The youth moistening the piece of the Holy *Eucharist* as he was ordered, put it into the Mouth of *Serapion*; who having swallowed it by degrees, immediately gave up the Ghost. So that 'tis evident by this Passage, that the Priest sent his Penitent only the more solid Species of the Sacrament, ordering the Youth to moisten it first for the easier Passage, and so to give it him, in the mean while the good old Man did not complain that any thing was wanting. On the contrary, upon his receiving he presently dyed in Peace; and God that miraculously preserved him till he had received this mighty Grace, immediately delivered him upon the receiving of it. *St. Denys*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, who lived in the third Age of the Church, makes mention of this History in a Letter recorded at large by *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea*; and he writ it to an eminent Bishop, speaking of this Practice as an usual thing, which sheweth that it was both received and authorised; and so holy otherwise, that God vouchsafed to confirm it by a visible Effect of his Grace.

The most ingenious, and most learned Protestants unanimously agree, That this Passage relates purely to the Consecrated

*Euseb. l. 6.
c. 44. edit.
Val.*

Tho. Smith.
Ep. de Ec-
cles. Gr. bod.
stat. p. 107.
108. 2. ed.
130. &
seqq.
Hist. de
l' Euc. 1. p.
c. 12. p.
145.
Du Bourd.
chap. 22.
P. 357.

crated Bread. Mr. Smith in a learned and judicious Treatise, which he wrote, some Years since, of the present State of the Greek Church, is satisfied in this Point: Moreover he confesseth, that in the private Communion, the Species of Consecrated Bread only, was kept, as a Reserve in particular for the Sick. But the famous Minister *M. de la Roque* in his Treatise of the Eucharist, and *M. du Bourdieu* of Montpellier, in his Book of the taking away the Cup, (dedicated to Mr. Claude, and by him approved, as also by some of his Bretheren) are not so ingenuous, nor so sincere: These Men would persuade us, that the forementioned Penitent received the Blessed Sacrament in both kinds, and that they were mingled together, as the Practice was sometime after these first Ages, and as it now is in the *Eastern Church* in their usual Communion of the Faithful. But not to insist upon the Novelty of mingling both kinds, and those so expressely separated in the Gospel, which was never heard of till the seventh Age, and then too in order only to its Condemnation; the Words of *St. Dorys* Bishop of *Alexandria*, admit not of these Gentlemen's Explication, since the Priest he there mentions doth not order the mingling of both kinds, but the moistening only of that which he gave; which being kept some days, according to the constant Practice of the Church, for the use of the Sick, was too dry for a poor agonizing Penitent, and therefore might well want Moisture for its better Passage.

Conc.
Carth. 3.
c. 76. T. 3.
Conc. ult.
edit. Paris.

Whence the Reverend Fathers of the Third Council of Carthage (which *St. Austin* himself Subscrib'd to) said, That we ought to infuse the Holy Eucharist in the Mouth of a dying Person: *Infundi ori ejus Eucharistiam*. This word *infundi*, or *infusing*, doth not relate only to the Blood, as some may imagine; for we see in *Eusebius*, and in the History of *Serapion*, that tho' nothing was Administred but the Species of Bread, nevertheless it was called *infusing* it, when they only moistened it, to facilitate its Passage. And *Rufinus* that wrote in the time of the Third Council of Carthage, in his Translation of *Eusebius*, expresses *Serapion's* way of Communicating in the same Phrase with the Council, saying, They infused a little of the Holy Eucharist in the Mouth of the good old Man: Which both shews the Custom of these primitive Times, and explains what the Infusion of the Eucharist was. Nothing

Nothing but the Interest of Truth obligeth me, to take notice of this, since in Conclusion it matters not, as to our present Purpose, whether they gave the Sick the Body alone, or the Blood alone, for this would be still Communion under one kind. For as to the Administring of both Kinds mingled together, no honest or knowing Man can find the least Foot-steps of it in the Primitive times. The History of *Serapion* sufficiently sheweth, that nothing but the Consecrated Bread was carried to the Sick from the Priest: That they moisten'd it at the Penitent's House in order to its freer Passage: and, That they so little thought of mixing it in the Blood, that they used commonly some other Liquor to moisten it, which they found at the sick Man's House: In short, we hear nothing of this Administration of the Body and Blood mingled together, till the Seventh Age, when in the Council of *Brague*, by an express Canon, it was prohibited; whence we may easily understand how little Appearance there was of this Custom in the Third Age, and in the times of St. *Dionys* of *Alexandria*; or in the Fourth, and in the time of the Third Council of *Carthage*.

Conc. Brac.
6. 1. 6. c.
ult. Ed. 2.

We shall see in another place how difficult it was to establish this mingling of Kinds, even in the Tenth, or Eleventh Age, especially in the *Latin Church*; and this will be a new Argument to shew how little it was thought on in the First Ages, or in the Third Council of *Carthage*; which is an undoubted Argument or Evidence, That the Communion which was then ordain'd for the Sick, was without Difficulty under one Kind alone, and that of Bread, as the good *Serapion* himself took it. Which we must easily acknowledge, when we shall reflect, how St. *Ambrose* Communicated at his Death about the same time.

Paul. vit.
St. Amb.

We have the Life of this great Man, which *Paulinus* his Deacon and Secretary (mistaken by *Erasmus* for that great St. *Paulinus* Bishop of *Nola*) wrote at the entreaty of St. *Austin*, and dedicated to him, where he relates how St. *Honoratus*, the famous Bishop of *Verceil*, which then came to assist the Saint at his Death, at dead of Night, heard these Words three times: *Rise, stay not, he is going to die.* He came down, gave him the Body of our Lord; and the Saint no sooner received it, but immediately expired. Who seeth not this good man represented

sented to us as a Favourite of Heaven, as one whom God himself took care of, that he should die in such a state wherein nothing could be wanting after the receiving the Body of our Lord? And who then could in the least doubt of his well communicating, since he received after the same manner as St. *Ambrose* did at the hour of his Death? or as St. *Honoratus* gave it? or as it was mention'd to St. *Austin*? or as the whole Church observ'd it, without the least suspicion of Novelty, or Strangeness?

Geor. Calixtus.
Disput. Cont.
Comm. sub una
specie, p.
162.

The Subtilty of the Protestants is grounded on this Passage. The famous *George Calixtus*, the most considerable of our Modern *Lutherans*, and the Learned'st Adversary we have, as to the communicating under both Kinds, asserts, That St. *Ambrose* received in both; and to answer *Paulinus*, who relates only, that he received the Body, and immediately thereupon expired; this subtil Minister hath a recourse to a Grammatical Figure, called *Synecdoche*, by which the Part is taken for the Whole, without so much as producing one Instance wherein such a kind of Speech on such an occasion, is used. Strange Effects of prejudice! We have in the Communion of *Serapion*, a clear Example, or Instance of Communion in one Kind, without the least shadow of a *Synecdoche*, since St. *Dionysius of Alexandria* so precisely mentioneth, That the solid part was only administred. We meet with the same Speech, and the same thing in the Council of *Carthage*; and St. *Ambrose* then communicated without the least mention of any thing but the Body. Moreover (for I could be demonstrative in this Point) it is manifest in all Ages, That the Body only was reserved for the usual Communion of the Sick: notwithstanding this, there are those who insisted on a *Synecdoche*, and that without so much as one Example to back it. What Blindness, or rather what Cavelling is this!

If these Gentlemen would be ingenuous, and as zealous to instruct others, as they are subtil to defend themselves, they would soon see, that the alledging a bare *Synecdoche* in this case, was wholly vain and impertinent: After this way of arguing, all things will lie open to Shifts and Evasions, and no place remain for certainty or satisfaction. He should come to the Point in particular proposed, and instead of what he insists on, produce some Instance wherein the Figure he would apply

ply to that of *Paulinus*, is made use of, to the same purpose. But *Calixtus* hath not one word of this; for this he knew, would be the only way to confute, or confound himself.

Besides, 'tis certain the Figure he speaks of, is not made use of in common Discourse, like that, as when we speak of eating together, to express an entire Feast; or as in the *Hebrew*, Bread comprehended all manner of nourishment. 'Tis not so in the Language of the Church, That the mentioning of the Body only includes the Body and Blood; on the contrary, you will find among the Fathers, That in all passages that mention the distribution of the Body and Blood, they are both clearly expressed; this was certainly the usual way of expressing it.

But not to trouble my self to no purpose with any Passages of the Fathers, where one is mention'd without the other, or the particular Reasons, that oblig'd them to that manner of expression, I shall aver to our present purpose, That I never met with any place that mentions the distribution of the Body and Blood, without expressly naming both.

'Twas as easie for *Calixtus* to find an Instance of this Nature as my self: and that there is no such Instance to be found, is evident, in that it hath escaped the eye of so subtil, and so industrious an Adversary.

I know also, That Mr. *Bourdieu*, who wrote since him, and, *Du Bourdi.* (as a diligent Reader and Follower of him, should have supplied his Defects) affirms, not only as to the Passage of *Pau-* 317. *linus*, and *St. Ambrose*, but even that of *Tertullian* also (viz.) That the Reason, why this ancient Father, speaking of private Communion (which we also shall treat of in its proper place) mention'd only the Body and the Bread, was, That he spoke by the Figure *Synecdoche*, which is very frequent in his Writings, and a common way of speaking amongst men. But as to the matter in hand, notwithstanding this bold Assertion, he produceth no more Instances, where this Speech was used, than *Calixtus* had done before. See here two Ministers labouring under the same Confusion. *Calixtus* confesseth that the Body only was named in the Communion of the Sick. Mr. *Bourdieu* saith, That in private Communion, nothing was mentioned but the Body. This doth not surprize us, because we believe, that in communicating only under the Species of
C Bread,

Bread, we receive his Blood also : These Ministers will believe nothing of it ; but save themselves under the shelter of an imaginary *Synecdoche* ; and both equally at a loss , as to their Instances, or Examples they should produce. What follows then but that their *Synecdoche* is merely pretended, and without any ground at all ? and particularly that *St. Paulinus* mentioneth only the Body in the Communion of *St. Ambrose* ; *St. Ambrose* received only the Body, as the Custom was even in that Age. Suppose he objecteth, That this great man immediately dy'd after the receiving of the Body ; yet so plain, and clear is the Matter of Fact in this Point, that there is no room for any subtil evasion, or for the introducing an imaginary Figure. But that we may fully convince these Ministers, let us suppose their *Synecdoche* as common in this Case, as it is rare, and unheard of ; let us see whether this agreeth with the present Passage or History of *St. Ambrose* : *Paulinus* saith, That *St. Honoratus* being retired to take his Nights Rest, a Voice from Heaven advis'd him, That his sick Penitent was going to die ; That the Saint immediately came down, gave him the Body of our Lord ; and that the Saint immediately on the receiving of it, gave up the Ghost. Why said he not that he died immediately after his receiving the precious Blood, if it was so in effect ? If it is so usual, as *Calixtus* would have it, That by his Body, is by *Synecdoche* understood his Body, and Blood ; 'tis as natural, That by the same Figure, and on the same Reason we should sometimes find, that the Blood alone should signify the receiving of both Kinds, both Body and Blood. And if ever this would have happened, it would have been on the occasion of *St. Ambrose's* Communion, and we should have met with it in the Passage *Paulinus* hath left us : Because his business was to shew us the receiving of the *Eucharist*, immediately followed by the Death of the Saint ; and to represent this great man dying like another *Moses* in the embraces of his Saviour ; if he would have shortned his Discourse, he should have finished it there where the Saint expired ; that is, at the receiving of the Blood, which is always the last ; and so much the more, in respect, that supposeth the other, and that immediately after the happy Saint expired. Nothing could have been more sensible than this, nothing could have been more natural, nothing could have left a deeper

deeper impression. If therefore we find no mention of Blood in the Historian, 'tis because in effect St. *Ambrose* received it not.

Calixtus was too jealous that the Passage of *Paulinus* did import thus much ; and therefore he addeth, That perhaps they brought the Saint the precious Blood with the Body, as equally necessary ; but that St. *Ambrose*, prevented by his Death, had not time enough to receive it : Oh the pitiful Refuge of a sinking Cause ! If *Paulinus* had had but the least Idea of this, instead of representing a holy Bishop, as one that by a special Gift of Divine Providence, died, assisted with all the Comforts a Christian could desire, he should on the contrary, have observed by some particular Expression, That notwithstanding the Voice from Heaven, and the wonderful diligence of St. *Honoratus*, a sudden Death had robb'd the holy Penitent of the precious Blood of his Master, an Essential part of the Blessed Sacrament : But these Notions were not dreamt of in those days, and the Saints believed they gave all, and that all that was necessary was received with his Body only.

Thus the two Answers of *Calixtus* are shewn to be equally frivolous : Mr. *Bourdieu*, his great Disciple also, had no Courage to assert either the one or the other ; but in the great Confusion and Absurdity so evident a Testimony hath brought him, he endeavours to save himself by this Answer, That St. *Ambrose* received the Communion as he could ; not reflecting on his Assertion of *Serapion's* Communicating under both Kinds ; and that if it had been the Custom, it had been as easie to have given it St. *Ambrose* also in the same manner. Moreover, if they had thought these Kinds inseparable, as the Minister, and those of his Religion, pretends, 'tis manifest they would rather have resolved to have given neither Kind, than to have given the one without the other : Thus are these Ministers confounded with their own Answers, and have nothing left them to combat with, but their own shadows.

Nevertheless he hath found out an Expedient to weaken the Authority of this Passage ; for he hath the confidence in an Age so quick-sighted as this is, to assert, That before this Example of St. *Ambrose*, we cannot find in the Works of the Ancients, the least shadow or sign of the Communion of the Sick. The Testimony of St. *Justin*, who, in his second Apology, saith,

Ibid. 382.

They carried the *Holy Eucharist* to those that were absent, doth not concern him : For *St. Justin* saith, he doth not expressly mention the sick, as if their being sick had been a sufficient reason to have deprived them of this common Consolation, and not a motive rather for their receiving it. But what will become of the Example of *Serapion* ? Is't not expressly said, he was sick, and like to die ? 'Tis true ; but *this was one of those who had sacrificed to Idols, and was now in the state of Penance.* So that to receive the *Eucharist* at ones Death, it was necessary by this, to have been first an Idolater ; and the Faithful, who all their Life-time are not excluded by any crime from the partaking of the Sacrament, shall be excluded from it at the point of death, even when they have most need of it. Thus a man puffs up himself with the thoughts of writing a learned Discourse, if like this Minister, he can but heap up an abundance of Examples of those that dy'd without any mention of Communion ; without so much as dreaming that in such Descriptions as these, that which is most usual, is most commonly omitted, or that we know not apparently by this express Testimony of *Paulinus*, That the Bishop communicated, except the Author had inserted the particular care that God Almighty had shewed in procuring him this Favour. But can this Minister be ignorant that in such occasions, one positive Testimony is sufficient to confound a thousand Negatives that are built on such a weak Foundation ? And could he not see that the Example only of *St. Ambrose*, sets forth an establish'd Custom, since *St. Honoratus*, as soon as he understood that this great man was at the point of Death, he knew without any mention of it, that that was the critical minute of giving him the Blessed Sacrament ? yet all this signifieth nothing : The Ministers are resolv'd to continue their Doubts of this Custom, that they may fix some colour of singularity or novelty on a Communion that was so evidently administred to a Saint, and by a Saint, and that under one Kind too. And what shall we reply to *Calixtus*, who on this occasion, is wholly wrapt up in wonder, and astonishment, that we should have the confidence to place *St. Ambrose* in the number of those who communicated under one Kind ? And is not this a strange piece of Arrogance to talk thus after a grave Historian, who was an eye-witness of what he writ ; and what he writ, he writ

Calixt. 11.
162.

at the Intreaty of *St. Austin*, and sent it to him. But this is one way of Answering, when they are in a manner Nonplus'd, to supply their Defect of Reason with a handsome Stock of Confidence. In fine, we meet with nothing in *Paulinus*, not to enlarge any farther, but the common Practice of the Church, where treating of what was reserved for the sick, there is no mention but of the Body. The Second Council of *Tours*, held in the Year 567. ordains, That the Body of our Lord should be placed on the Altar, not where the Images stood, *non in imaginario ordine, sed sub Crucis titulo*, but where the Cross was, and in the figure of a Cross.

*Conc. Tur.
2. c. 3. Tom.
Conc. Gall*

By the way you are to observe there were Images then set about the Altar; and there were Crosses also in these first Ages: 'Twas then under the Figure of a Cross the Sacred Body of our Lord was reserv'd, and only his Body: And therefore *Gregory of Tours*, Bishop of the Place when this Council was held, speaks of certain Cases or Tabernacles made Tower-wise, in which the Blessed Sacrament of the Body of our Lord was reserved, and that it was placed on the Altar in the time of the Sacrifice: Without doubt as an Object of publick Adoration.

*Greg. Tur.
l. i. c. 1. 6.*

By the Order of the famous *Hincmarus*, Archbishop of *Rheims*, who lived in the Ninth Age, there should be a Pyxe or Box, wherein the Holy Oblation, that was design'd as a Viaticum for the Sick at all times, was to be kept: And these Words, Holy Oblation, in the Sense of any one that understands the Language of Holy Church, signifies nothing but the Body, which was usually express'd either by the Word *Communion*, or simply by the Word *Eucharist*. In the mean while the Blood was expressed by its own natural Name, or that of the Chalice of our Lord.

*Can. Hinc.
ar. 8. Tom.
11. Conc.
Gall.
Leo 4. Hom.
Tom. 8.
Conc. Spic.
Tom. 2.
p. 261.*

We see at the same time a Decree of *Leo the IVth* where-in having spoke of the Body and Blood for the ordinary Communion of the Faithful, when he speaketh of the Sick, he mentions nothing but the Pyxe or Box wherein the Body of our Lord was reserved for their Viaticum.

This Ordinance is repeated in the following Age by the famous Bishop *Ratbierus*, Bishop of *Verona*; and sometime after in the Reign of King *Robert*, the Council of *Orleans* speaks of the Ashes of an Infant, which certain abominable Hereticks

*Gen. 1.
Conc.
Aurel. ibid.
673.*

kept

kept with the same Veneration the Christians devoutly reserved the Body of our Lord, as a Viaticum for those that were dying. We see the Body and Blood expressed here in the usual Communion of the Faithful, but the Body, only in the Communion of the Sick.

Bib. PP. To all these Authorities we must add that of the *Roman*
part. T. de *Ritual*, or the ancient Ceremonial of the *Roman Church*, cited
div. off. or explained by the Fathers of the Eighth or Ninth Ages. We see there in two places, that the Consecrated Bread was divided into three Parts; one, which was administered to the People; another, which was put into the *Chalice*; not for the Communion of the People, but for the Priest only, after he hath taken the Consecrated Bread by himself, as the modern Practice now is; the third, which was usually reserv'd on the Altar. This is that which was kept for the Sick, which was therefore call'd the *dying Man's Portion*, as *Micrologus*, an Author of the Eleventh Age saith: Which was also Consecrated to the Honour of Jesus Christ buried, as the two others represented his Conversation upon Earth, and his Resurrection. Those that well understand the old Expositors of Church Ceremonies are no Strangers to this Language, or the Mystery of these Holy Ceremonies.

Amphil. The Author of the Life of *St. Basil* observes also that this
vit. S. Basil. great Man separated the Consecrated Bread into three Parts, and hung up the Third over the Altar, in a golden Dove, which he made for that purpose. This third Part of the Consecrated Bread, which he had placed there, was without doubt, that which was reserved for the Sick, and those golden
Conc. Doves hanging over the Altar, were used of old in the *Greek*
Const. sub. *Church*, as it appeareth by the Council of *Constantinople* held by
Mennas *Mennas*, in *Justinian's* Reign, or Empire. We meet also with these Doves among the *Latins* much about the same time.
Act. 5. T. 5. All our Authors in general make mention of them; and the
Conc. last Will and Testament of *Perpetuus*, Bishop of *Tours*, reckons
Test. Perp. among the Vessels, and Instruments that were used about the
T. 5. Spicil. Sacrifice, a Silver Dove, as a Holy Repository for the Blessed Sacrament, wherein it was reserved for the Sick.

To conclude, without mentioning the name of *Amphilochius*, who was Contemporary to *St. Basil*, and is supposed to have writ his Life; I grant, the Passage taken out of his Life, hath

no Force with it beyond the time in which it was writ, let the Author be who it will. Let them alledge, if they please, that the Author attributes to *St. Basil*, the Practice of those Times, wherein his Life was compos'd; yet this is enough to confirm, what otherwise is certain, That the Custom of reserving the *Species* of Bread only for the Sick, is of great Antiquity in the *Greek Church*; since we find this Life of *Saint Basil* long ago translated into *Latin*, in the time of *Charles the Bald*, and cited by *Aeneas Bishop of Paris*, as eminent in those times for his Piety as his Learning; who cites the forementioned Passage in this Life, where he speaks of the Doves, and the Sacrament of our Lord, which was hung over the Altar.

Æn. Ep. Par. l. adv. Grac. T. 4. Spic. p. 80. 81.

I could here also instance those *Pyxes, Ciboriums, or Boxes*, *Anast. Bib.* that are reckoned among the Presents *Charlemagne* made to the *vit. Leon. 3. Roman Church*; besides abundance of other Examples which *T. 2. Conc. Gal.* Antiquity abounds with.

And to shew how Conformable the Tradition of the First and Last Ages is, and as it were all of piece; as in the First and Primitive Ages, the History of *Serapion*, and the Council of *Carthage* seem perfectly to agree, both ordering the Sick should Communicate under one kind, and that moistned in some Liquor: The same Custom will equally appear by what follows, or in the following Ages.

We find in more than six hundred Years ago among the ancient Customs of *Clugny*. It is more than five hundred Years ago that *St. Udulrick*, Monk of this Order, inserted them amongst the ancient Records, which Work is cited confidently by the Minister *de la Roque* in his Treatise of the *Eucharist*. This Book insinuateth to us, That the Religious that were sick received only the Body, and that moisten'd in common Wine; thus did the most Religious, Holiest, and most Famous Monastery in the World communicate their Sick. From hence we may easily see what the Custom of the Holy Church was. Wee meet, tis true, every where with the Cup, but for no other purpose than to moisten the Consecrated Bread in for its easier Passage.

Ant. Conf. Clun. l. 3. c. 28. T. 4. Spic. Hist. Eu. 1. p. c. 16. p. 183.

The *Greeks* have retained this Tradition as well as the *Latins*, and as their inviolable Custom is, to Consecrate no *Eucharist* for the Sick, but on the Feast of *Holy-Thursfday*, they mingled

Const. O. don. Par. Ep. c. 5. ar. 3. T. 10. C. Const. Ep. an. T. 11. in Syn. Bajoc. c. 77. ibid. 2. p.

mingled the *Species* of Bread, which by long keeping was grown dry, either with Water, or with common Wine. For as to the Consecrated Wine, 'tis clear, that could not keep so long, especially in hot Countries; so that their Custom of Consecrating but once a Year for the Sick, obliged them to Communicate them always under one Kind (*viz.*) that of Bread, which was easily preserved, their leavened Bread being better for this end than ours unleavened, after its being dry'd; of which we shall now treat.

To deal ingenuously, I must confess, they make a Cross with the Sacred Blood on the Consecrated Bread, which is reserved for the Sick. But besides, that this is no giving of them the Cup, as the Holy Gospel imports, or any Distinction betwixt his Body and his Blood, or Separation, which alone convinceth our Reformers of the necessity of Communicating in both Kinds. 'Tis evident there remains nothing of those two or three Drops of Sacred Blood, at the Years end; and so but one Kind, and that of Bread only, is left for the Sick. Besides, after all, this *Grecian Custom* of mixing the Blood with his Holy Body (for which we have not the least Footsteps, either in their ancient Fathers or Canons) is but an Innovation amongst them, which in the following Discourse shall more evidently appear.

Those who are used to deny every thing that makes against them, may deny also these Customs of the *Greek Church*; but with Men that are ingenuous, or never so little versed in the *Greek Liturgies*, or common *Rituals*, there will be no Room left for any Doubt in this Point.

And as to the *Latin Church*, the Councils are full of necessary Precautions for keeping or preserving the Body of our Lord, and for carrying it with all Respect and Decorum imaginable, in order to the Peoples adoring it. There is mention also of the *Pyxes* and Linen in which it was kept, as also of the Care which the Priests ought to have in renewing the *Hosts* every eight Days, and in swallowing the old ones, before their taking of the Holy Cup. Besides, 'tis remarkable, That they were to burn the old *Hosts* that were kept too long, and to keep their Ashes under the Altar, without the least mention all this while of any Viol or Glass, for the preserving of his precious Blood, or any Cautions for the keeping of it,

Conc. sub
Edg. Reg.
38. T. 9.
Conc. p.
628.
Conc. Bit.
2. ib. p. 865.
Const. O-
don. Paris.
Epif. T. 10.
p. 1802.
Const.
Epif. an.
T. 11. 1. p.

it, tho' the other Species was more obnoxious to Alteration.

And here we must take notice also of a Canon that is objected to us by all the Ministers: And that is the Canon of the Council of *Tours*, which is not in the Volume of the Councils, but in the Works of those two *Carthusians*, *Burchard*, and *Yvo*, who compil'd or collected the Canons of the Eleventh Age. This Canon saith, as others also, That *the Host, which was reserved for the Sick* (*viz.*) the Species of Bread, ought every eighth Day to be renewed: But what follows is not to be met with thro' the whole *West* (*viz.*) That it ought also to be moistened in his Blood, to the end that we may say, his Body and Blood both, are truly given.

Burch. Col.
C. l. 5. c. 9.
Yvo dec. 2.
P. c. 19.

If this Canon did any thing confound us, or made any thing against us, we might answer with *Tuburtin*, no more than what is true, That *Burchard* and *Yvo*, the *Carthusians*, heaped up a abundance of things without either Choice or Judgment, giving us many Pieces, as the Works of the Ancients, which were not so: But to deal with the utmost Degree of Ingenuity, we'll allow the Canon Authentick, and exactly Transcribed; but we must say also that it is not in the number of those which were afterwards admitted, since there's not the least Shadow of it to be met with in any other.

Aubert. de
Euc. lib. 2.
in Exam.
Pii. p. 288.

Moreover this Canon, which is no where to be met with, but in the forementioned Collections, certainly was not made long before; for the mixing only of his Body and Blood, is evident enough against the Antiquity of it. But suppose it established in what time it will, 'tis clear before that, the Custom was to mention his Body and his Blood, in giving only his Body; and this from the inseparable Grace of both that attended either; or from the natural Union of both, by way of Concomitance. Notwithstanding this, the Council was scrupulous in using this Expression; and thought, That in Expressing both Kinds, there might appear a necessity of giving both. In short, 'tis true, in some Sense, to call it justly his Body and his Blood, we ought to give both Kinds, since the natural Import of those Words, is to manifest what each of them contains, by virtue of its Institution. But they must acknowledge the mixing of them; for eight Days keeping after this manner, was but a pitiiful Refuge for the Preserving of both

Kinds : And that this part of the Canon that mentioneth so particular a Custom, ought in no wise to prejudice so many Decrees, wherein nothing like it is to be met with, but rather the contrary.

That which is most certain, is, that this Canon demonstrateth, That the *Holy Species* of his Blood was not so easily preserv'd, and therefore what they most minded in this case, was the preserving the *Holy Species* of his Body. Moreover, as to the mixing of them, what we say touching the *Greeks*, may be proper here ; and in spite of all the Ministers Subtilties, 'twill be evident by this Canon, they thought themselves not obliged to make the Communicant drink, or to give the Blood separately from his Body, to set forth the violent Death of our Lord, nor so much as to give him any other Liquor, since in eight days time, 'tis clear nothing remained, but what was solid and dry. So that this Canon, so much boasted by the Ministers, serves only to shew the Liberty Holy Church took in the Administration of the *Eucharist* as to its Kinds.

After all our Observations, 'tis most certain, that neither *Greeks* or *Latins*, believed that what was writ in the Holy Gospel of the Communion of both Kinds, was either essential or expressly commanded ; on the contrary, it hath been the constant Belief of the Primitive Ages, That one *Species* was enough to Legitimate a Communion, since the Custom was, to preserve but one, and to give but one Kind to the Sick.

Justin.
Apol. 1.

To object here that they carried both Kinds in general to those that were absent, will be impertinent. I confess, *St. Justin* is clear in this Point ; but as to us, what signifies such impertinent Citations ? 'Tis one thing to say with *St. Justin*, That both kinds of Sacrament were carried during the Celebration in the Church, as *Mr. la Roque* saith : And another, to say, That it was the Custom of Holy Church to reserve them for the Sick ; especially in times of Persecution, when it was so dangerous to frequent the publick Churches. We must aver the same thing of *St. Exuperus*, Bishop of *Tolouse*, of whom *St. Jerome* writ, That after he had sold the rich Vessels of the Church for the Redemption of Captives, and the Assistance of the Poor, he carried the Body of our Lord in a Pannier, and the Blood in a Vessel of Glass ; he carried them, saith *St. Hierome* ; but he doth not say he kept them, which is our present Question :

on :

on : And I acknowledge, that when they had a convenient Opportunity they Communicated the Sick under both Kinds, and when there was no Fear at all of an Alteration or Change in the *Species*, they made no Scruple of it. But it is as certain, by the Cloud of so many Witnesses, that whereas the *Species* of Wine could not easily be preserv'd, the usual Communion of the Sick, was, as *Serapion*, and St. *Ambrose* Communicated, under the *Species* of Bread only.

In effect we read also in the Life of *Lewis* the Sixth, Sir-*Hist. Fr.*
named the *Gros*, by *Sugerus* Abbot of St. *Denys*, that in the *Scr. T. 4:*
last Sickness of this Prince they brought him both the Body and Blood of our Saviour ; but we see also that this Faithful Historian thought himself obliged to give some Reason for it, and to advertise, *That it was at the end of the Mass, they devoutly brought them by way of Procession to the Chamber of the Penitents.* Which sufficiently sheweth what the ordinary Custom was, where there were no such Occasions.

But that which mainly clears the Point, is, that Mr. *la Roque*, in the Conclusion agrees with us, as to the Matter of Fact in Debate. There's no more Difficulty to Communicate the Sick under the only *Species* of Bread, than under the *Species* of Wine only ; a Practice which this curious Gentleman hath observed about the seventh Age in the eleventh Council of *Toledo*, Canon XI. He saith the same of the eleventh Age, and as *Hist. Euc.*
much of Pope *Paschalis* the Second, who, as he saith, allowed *1. p. ch. 12.*
the same to little Infants : He is so far from condemning these *p. 150, 160.*
Practices, that he takes a great deal of Pains in Defence of them, *Canc. Tol.*
and excuses them on the account of an invincible Necessity : *11. Pasch.*
As if any part of the Consecrated Bread, when moistened, *2. Ep. 32.*
could not be as easily swallowed by the Sick, or even by Infants themselves, as Wine it self. But what doth this prejudice our Conclusion, That Holy Church had always a full Liberty of Communicating under one Kind, without violating the Integrity of Communion, or omitting any thing essential to that blessed Sacrament. *ad Pont.*

And this is what we find on the Communion of the Sick, by the Tradition of all Ages. If any of those Practices which I have observed, may insinuate any extraordinary Respect or Veneration to the *Holy Eucharist*, and so surprise our Reformers as with a piece of Novelty, I will shew in few Words, and

that without any difficulty; That the substance of it was practised in the *Primitive Church*, or rather that it began with *Christianity* it self. But not to wander too far from our present Subject; 'tis sufficient to shew by comparing the Customs and Observances of the first and last Ages, That the Tradition of communicating the Sick under one Kind, and that of Bread too, was constantly practis'd; the *Holy Church*, that is always a tender Mother to her Children, if she had thought both Kinds necessary to Salvation, rather than to deprive them of the Benefit thereof, would have ordered an extraordinary consecration of them, in the Chamber of the Sick, as in some cases the custom was: on the contrary, she would the rather have given them to dying persons, as a more comfortable *Viaticum* to strengthen and encourage them under the Agony and Combat of Death.

In fine, I cannot believe these Reformers will object any thing as to the changing of the *Species*, which we shall have occasion to mention often in this Discourse. The impertinent cavils their Books are full of, touch not our present Question, but that of the *Real Presence*, in which respect they ought to have been rejected long ago as impertinent; it being too clear, as I observ'd before, That the Son of God, who would not perform any sensible Miracle in this Mystery, was not to discover upon any account, whatsoever he resolv'd expressly to hide or conceal from our Senses; much less to alter any thing in the outward administration of his Body and Blood to the Faithful.

There's no one of common sense, or that is capable to make the least reflection, but must conclude with us, That these pretended Indecencies of our Adversaries relate purely to our Senses; but in truth they are too much below the Sacred Majesty of Jesus Christ, to stop or prevent the course of his Designs, or to hinder his desire of uniting himself to us after so particular a manner.

'Tis so usual in these Cases with our *Pretended Reformers*, to skip from one Question to another, that I think my self oblig'd to keep them to their Question by this Advice. The same reason obligeth me also to desire them to take no advantage from the Expression of Bread and Wine, which we shall meet with so often, since they know, That in believing as we do, a change of the Substance, the first name is yet allowed to the

the thing changed, as *Moses* called a Rod, which was turned into a Serpent, still a Rod; or Water that was made Blood, still Water; and the Angels that appeared to him like men, men; not to insinuate to you, that *St. John* calls the Water that was turned into Wine at the Marriage of *Cana*, still Water. 'Tis usual for men in shortening and facilitating their Discourses, to speak according to Appearances; neither is any advantage usually taken from such kind of Speeches; and I believe no one will object to a Philosopher, that should defend the motion of the Earth, that he destroys his *Hypothesis*, when he saith, *The Sun riseth*, or *The Sun setteth*.

After this slight interruption, which nothing but Candor obliged me to, I return to my Subject, and to the Matter of Fact which I promised to explain, to shew the Antiquity of Communion in one Kind.

SECT.

S E C T. III.

SECOND CUSTOM.

Communion of little Infants.

THE Second Matter of Fact which I shall produce, is that of giving the Communion to little Infants Baptized, which in the Primitive Ages, and generally in those following, was administered to them under the *Species* of Wine. St. Cyprian in his Treatise *De lapsis*, authoriseth this Practice, who suffered Martyrdom in the Third Age. This great man with a Gravity worthy of himself, representeth to us here what happened in the Church, and in his presence, to a young Girl, who was made to take a piece of Bread that had been offered to Idols. The Mother, who was ignorant of it, carried her notwithstanding, according to the Custom, to the Church : But God, who was willing to shew by a miraculous Sign, how unworthy she was of the Society of the Faithful, after her participating of the impure Table of Devils, caused a great disturbance, and unquietness extraordinary in this Child, during the Prayers ; as if by these Symptoms, in defect of Words, saith St. Cyprian, she was forced to declare, as well as she could, the Misfortune she had fallen into : This disturbance which held her all Prayer-time, encreased at the approach of the Holy Eucharist, wherein JESUS CHRIST was so signally present : For thus St. Cyprian goeth on ; After the accustomed Solemnities, the Deacon, who presented the Holy Cup to the Faithful, being come where this Infant was, JESUS CHRIST, who manifesteth his Power as he pleaseth, created a terrible impression of the presence of his Divine Majesty in this Child ; she turned aside her Face, saith St. Cyprian, as being not able to bear so great a Majesty ; she stopped her Mouth, she refused the Cup.

Cup. But when she was forced to take some drops of the precious Blood, she could not retain them, saith the good Father ; so great is the Power and Majesty of our Saviour. The Body of Jesus Christ would have had the same Effects: And St. Cyprian, who takes so much care to shew us the trouble the Child was in during Prayer-time, saith, This trouble and disturbance happened only at the taking of the Holy Cup, without the least mention of his Body, which sheweth the Holy Blood was offered as most proper to her Age.

Not but that the Holy Bread when moistened, might have been as effectual for Children, and as easily to be swallowed, since History informs us, That this young Girl had thus taken the Bread that was offered to Idols. But this is so far from prejudicing what I lay down, that on the contrary, it manifesteth how prevalent the Opinion was of one Kind being sufficient, since when there was not the least impossibility of giving the Body to those little ones, they so easily determin'd to give them only the Blood. It was enough that the solid part was not so proper for that Age: and that to give it thus effectually, they were obliged first to moisten it; in these Ages wherein we see they not so much as dream of mixing the *Species*, this would debase the Majesty of so great a Sacrament, it being the constant Belief of the Church, That the *Eucharist or Blessed Sacrament ought to be the first thing we take in the Morning fasting*. I say, this was the constant Belief; and not only in the time of St. *Augustin*, whose Authority we make use of, but in the time of St. *Cyprian* himself, as it appears by his Letter to *Cecilius*; and even before him, since in *Tertullian* we find, That the Faithful took the Holy Bread in private, before any other nourishment; and even before this, since they speak of it, as a constant and establish'd Custom. This Consideration for which alone they gave the Blood only to little Children, let it signifie, or import as much as it can, would have signified nothing in opposition to a Divine Commandment. 'Twas certainly the Belief, That there was no Divine Commandment to joyn both Kinds or *Species* together.

Mr. *La Roque* who would seem to say, That they mixed the Body and Blood together for these Children, hath not the courage to assert it roundly; and therefore modestly suspects, forth, That we may infer it from the Words of St. *Cyprian*,

Aug. Ep.
118. ad
Fun.
Ep. 63. li.
2. ad ux.
5.

Hist. Eneb.
1. sh. 12.
p. 145.

tho

tho' there is not the least Syllable that looks that way. But not to insist upon this, That the Discipline of those times would not admit of this mixture, St. *Cyprian* mentions nothing but Blood: *The Blood*, saith he, *could not tarry long in defiled Entrails*: and the distribution of the Holy Cup, of which the Infant or Child partaked, is so remarkably clear, that there is no room left for the Conjectures of Mr. *la Roque*. Besides, Instance is short and particular: the custom of giving the Communion to little Infants under the *Species* only of Wine is not to be disputed; and those Doubts some would raise, serve only to confound those who oppose the Authority of St. *Cyprian*, and the Church of his Time.

Hist. Euch. Certainly Mr. *la Roque* would have been more candid and
l. p. cb. 12. sincere, had he kept but to the Idea of the thing. The first
P. 145. time he mention'd the Passage of St. *Cyprian*, he saith, *They infused some of the Holy Cup into the Mouth of the Infant*; that is to say, some drops of the precious Blood, pure and without mixture, in the same manner as others received it, who also received his Body before. And moreover, we shall see that this Minister doth not condemn Pope *Pascal* 11. who, as he saith, permitted Infants to receive only under the *Species* of Wine, such is the force of Conscience, that he could not well deny this Practice.

Du Bourd. When Mr. *du Bourdieu* was sensible of this Passage of St. *Cyprian*,
c. rep. 137. and that it was objected to him by a Catholic, this Minister confessed nothing was given in effect to this Child, but only the consecrated Wine. Yet would he save himself, by saying, That the Ancients who believed Communion absolutely necessary to little Children, gave it them as they could; and therefore the Deacon of St. *Cyprian*, believing the Child damn'd if it should die without the *Eucharist*, opened its mouth by force, to poure in something of the Wine; and that a particular Instance of Necessity could not truly be called a Custom. What Subtilties and Evasions are here to stifle manifest Truth! Where are those extraordinary Reasons that the Minister hath dreamt of? Is there so much as one word in St. *Cyprian*, that but hints at the danger of the Infant, as the Motive of communicating it? Is it not on the contrary, too clear, by the tenor of the Discourse, That this Holy Sacrament was given to this Infant, because it was the Custom to give it to them all,

when-

whenever they were brought to Church? Why will Mr. Bour- Cb. 20. p. 345.
diu divine that this little Girl had never communicated? Was
 she never Baptized? Was it not the custom to administer the
 Communion to them at their Baptism? What signifieth it then
 to talk of the fear of its being damned, if it should die with-
 out the *Eucharist*, since they gave it the same time as they
 gave it Baptism? Or was it the Belief of the Primitive Church,
 That it was not enough for the salvation of an Infant, to com-
 municate once, but that it should be damned without a second
 Communion? What strange *Chimera's* do men form to them-
 selves, rather than yield to the force of Truth, and ingenuously
 acknowledge their Error? But to what purpose should we
 trouble our selves with the Question of the necessity of the
Eucharist, and St. *Cyprian's* Error, as they would have it in this
 Point? Grant that this holy Martyr and the Church in his
 time believed that Communion was absolutely necessary for
 Children, what will this advantage Mr. *du Bourdieu*? and who
 seeth not on the other side, That if both Kinds are essential
 to the Sacrament, as these pretended Reformers maintain, the
 stronger the Belief is of the necessity of Communicating In-
 fants, the less will any one dispence with either of the Kinds
 in this case? Mr. *du Bourdieu* was too sensible of this Conse-
 quence; and in his second Reply he would divine, without
 the least Authority from St. *Cyprian*, or shadow in his Discourse,
 That this little Girl, when she was so cruelly and so miracu-
 lously tormented after the receiving the Blood, had already re-
 ceived the Body without the least disturbance. Thus you see
 to what Absurdities men are driven by such strange Re-
 plies!

But why should we dispute this Point any longer? The
 best Interpreter of Custom, is Custom it self. I would say,
 nothing demonstrates a Practice or Custom truly Primitive, so
 much as its constant continuation from former to latter Ages.
 That of Communicating little Children under the only *Species*
 of Wine, which we see established in the third Age, and in
 the time of St. *Cyprian*, was always so common, and usual, that
 we meet with it in succeeding Ages. We meet with it in the
 fifth or sixth Age in the Books of *Johann*, where this Religious
 man, recounting the three Sacraments they usually gave, in a
 time when the Christian Religion was establish'd, they baptized

*Joh. de
 verb. incar.
 l. 4. c. 18.*

very few but the Children of the Faithful. *They baptize them,* saith he, *after that they anoint them; (that is, they give them the Sacrament of Confirmation, and as last they give them the Holy Blood.* He mentions no Body, because there was none given to the Children. Therefore He takes a great care in the same place, to explain how the Blood may be given before the Body; which since it cannot be admitted in the Communion of those of riper years, could only be admitted then in the Infancy of the Faithful. Thus the Custom of the third Age is already arrived to the sixth, and continues not there, for we meet with it in later Ages, and even in the present Age among the *Greeks*, according to what *Allarius* the Catholic, and *Thomas Smith* the Protestant Minister, Both equally assert, with a long Testimony of Authors; and there can be no difficulty in this Point.

*Allat. Tr.
de cons. sur.
Eccl. An-
not. de Com.
Origen.*

*Th. Smith
Ep. de Ec-
cl. Gr. p.
104. 1 Ed.*

'Tis true, Mr. *Smith* varies something in his second Edition; for they are a little cautious in *England* of establishing an Example, or Instance, which we make use of for the authenticating Communion under one Kind. Mr. *Smith* observing in his Preface the advantage we might reap from thence, thought to rob us by two or three weak *Modern* Testimonies among the *Greeks*, who had either studied in *England*, or resided there, and whose Writings are printed in Protestant Countries.

The last of the Testimonies he alledges, is, that of the Archbishop of *Samos*, whose capacity and integrity we are sufficiently acquainted with. He is at present fixed at *London*; and Mr. *Smith* gives us a Letter which he writ to him, wherein he saith, *That after the Baptism of Infants, the Priest holding the Chalice wherein is the Blood, with the Body of our Lord reduced into small Particles, takes in a little spoon one drop of this Blood so mixed, that there remains in the spoon some Crumbs of the consecrated Bread, which is sufficient for the Child's partaking of the Body of our Lord.* Mr. *Smith* adds, *That these Crumbs are so small, that they are scarce perceivable, and that they stick to the spoon, tho' never so little dip in this Sacred Liquor.* Lo here the Sum of what may be inferred from a *Grecian*, who is kept at *London*, and from Mr. *Smith* in behalf of Communion given under both Kinds to Children baptized in the *Greek Church*. That is, that they gave them the Blood in which the Body was mixed; but so far from a design of giving them the Sacred Body, that they give them not so much as the least Particle they can visibly see on the surface of this

this holy Liquor, and which they reserve for those of riper years. They please themselves in thinking some insensible Particle of the Consecrated Bread sticks to the Child's spoon: This is their communicating them under both Kinds. Had not Mr. Smith truly preceded better, not to have altered any thing in his Book? And will not every man of sense conclude himself obliged to stand to that which he said ingenuously in his first Edition; and so much the rather since he finds it quadrates with that ancient Tradition which we have shewn you?

And if we find the Communion of little Children under the Species only of Wine in the Greek Church, we meet with it also among the Latins. We meet with it, as Mr. la Roque saith, in the Decrees of Pope Paschal the II. as we have seen of late, that is to say, in the Eleventh Age. The same Church gives Instance of it in the Twelfth Age; and Hugo de S. V. *Hug. de S. V. 20.* *crud.* *Tb. 3. c.* so much extolled by St. Bernard, saith expressly, *The Blessed Sacrament was not given to little Infants at their Baptism, but under the Species only of Blood; whose Doctrine a little after is, That under each Species the Body and Blood of Christ were both received.*

William de Champeaux Bishop of Chalon, who had an intimacy with the same St. Bernard, hath the same Doctrine, with the same manner of communicating little Children. Father Mabillon, a *Benedictine* of the Congregation of St. Maur (as sincere as he is able) found in a certain ancient Manuscript a long Passage of this worthy Bishop (equally famous for his Piety as his Learning) where he teaches *That he who receives one Species only, receives Jesus Christ whole and entire, because (saith he) he is not received neither by little and little, nor by parts, but whole and entire, under one or two Species: for which reason they give the Chalice only to Infants who's baptized, because they cannot receive the Bread, not therefore that they the less receive Jesus Christ whole and entire, under the Species of Wine only.*

The Ministers confounded at these Practices that are so evident in all former Ages, usually fling in our way some inferior Questions, to divert us from the principal one. They exaggerate the abuse of giving the Communion to little Children or Infants, for so they are pleased to phrase it, in spite of the Authority of all former Ages; an Abuse which they say was founded on the great and dangerous Error of the absolute ne-

Ex lib.
MS. diſt.
Pancris. re-
lat. in
Præf. Sac.
3. Bened. p.
78.

cessary of receiving the *Eucharist* in all Ages, under pain of Eternal Damnation ; which Error, even with them, is the Error of *St. Augustine*, *St. Cyprian*, *St. Innocent* Pope, *St. Cyril*, *St. Chrysostome*, *St. Cesarius* Bishop of *Arles*, and not only of many of the ancient Fathers, but also of many Ages. Oh holy Antiquity, and truly Primitive Church, too rashly censured by Ministers, without getting any thing by it, besides the pleasure of drawing the people into a dangerous Opinion of the Churches erring, even in the purest Times! For in the main, what signifieth this Controversie as to our present subject? Did the Primitive Church believe the *Eucharist* necessary for little Infants? we have already shewn that the supposition of the necessity of both *Species* to the Essence of this Sacrament, would have been a particular Motive to have given it them under both. Why therefore did they give it them under one only? And what can the Ministers answer to this, but that the Primitive Church, to the Error of believing the Communion absolutely necessary to Salvation, annexed that of believing the Communion whole and entire under one *Species* only; and that by fixing so gross an Error on so pure an Antiquity, they are willing to shew themselves visibly in an Error?

Our Doctrine, God be thanked doth not oblige us to such extravagant Excesses. I could easily shew here how the Grace or Benefits of the Holy *Eucharist* is necessary for all the Faithful; how the *Eucharist* with its Grace is virtually contained in Baptism; which erects in the hearts of the Faithful that sacred Right or Title which they there receive, to the Body and Blood of our Lord; and how it is the privilege of Holy Church to dispense at any time with the Exercise of this Right. I might also on these Grounds shew (with *William* Bishop of *Chalon*, so faithfully cited by Father *Mabillon*) that, if some particularly have seemed to believe the necessity of the *Eucharist*, yet this Opinion was so far from being Universal, that we find the contrary maintained by his Contemporaries, as *Hugo de Saincto Victore*, quoted in Mr. *de la Roque's* Book, and many others. I could also tell you how these Authors have expounded *St. Austin* after *St. Fulgentius*, and shew with them by express passages, and by the whole Doctrine of this Father, how far he is from that Error that is imputed to him. But 'tis my design here to shew, what we are to believe as to the *Species* and

not

*Hug. de S.
Vit. l. 1.
erud. The-
ol. c. 20.*

not to trouble or confound my Readers with any other Questions. Therefore I meddle not with them, and without loading my Discourse with unnecessary Searches or Examinations, I shall plainly shew you in few words the Faith of the Catholic Church.

The Church always believed, and does still, That Infants may receive the *Eucharist* as well as Baptism; and finds no more objection in those words of St. Paul, *Let a man examine himself*, ^{1 Cor. 11. 28.} and so let him eat, as to Communion, than she finds, as to Baptism, in the words of our Saviour, *Teach and Baptize*: But as she knows that the *Eucharist*, after a full Remission of their Sins in Baptism, cannot be absolutely necessary to their Salvation, she looks on't, as a matter of pure Discipline, to give, or not to give the Communion at that Age. ^{Matt. 23. 19.}

Whence for good and solid Reasons she gave it the space of eleven, or twelve hundred years, and for others as solid, she hath omitted the giving it from that time. But Holy Church, who found her self free as to the communicating or not communicating of Children, could never believe she had liberty to communicate them in a manner contrary to the Institution of Jesus Christ, nor would she ever have administered one *Species* alone, had she looked on both as inseparable by their Institution.

And in one word, to disengage our selves at once from these needless Disputes: when the Church gave the Communion to little Infants under the *Species* of Wine alone, she either judged this Sacrament necessary to their Salvation, or she did not: If she thought it not necessary, why such ado to give it, and yet to give it wrong? If she thought it necessary, 'tis a new Demonstration, that she believed the Essentials of the Sacrament were effectually contained under one Kind alone.

And to shew that this was her belief, the same Holy Church, which gave the *Eucharist* to little Children, under the *Species* of Wine alone, gave them it without any Scruple when more advanced in years under the *Species* of Bread only. None can be ignorant that the ancient Custom of the Church was to give to innocent Children the remainder of the Sacred Body of our Lord after the Communion of the Faithful. 'Twas the Custom of some Churches to burn these sacred Remainers, and particularly of the Church of Jerusalem, as *Hesychius* Priest of that ^{Hesych. in Lev. 1. 2.} Church 68.

Church relates, Jesus Christ is equally above all Corruption; but Human Sense required that out of respect and veneration to this Blessed Sacrament, what was most inoffensive to the Senses should be observed; and they had rather burn these sacred Remainers, than to see them corrupt, when kept, which might nauseate the Senses of the Believers, and seem in a manner to debase the dignity of so great a Sacrament. That which the Church of *Jerusalem* consumed by fire, the Church of *Constantinople* gave to little Children, looking on them, in their time of

Evag. l. 2. c. 35. Innocence, as the holiest of their Vessels. *Evagrius* writ in the sixth Age, that this was the ancient Custom of the Church of *Constantinople*. Mr. *de la Roque* takes notice of this Custom; and *Conc. Marse. 2. c. 2.* sheweth us the same practice at the same time in *France*, where *T. 1. Conc. Gall. Hist.* a Council ordained, The Remainder of the Sacrifice after Mass, *Euch. l. 1. p. c. 16. p.* should be given sprinkled with Wine *Wednesdays* and *Fridays* to innocent Children, who were obliged to fast in order to their receiving of them. Certainly they received the Body of our Lord, as well as the rest of the Faithful. *Evagrius* styles these Remainers the Particles of the Immaculate Body of Jesus Christ our Lord; and thus Mr. *de la Roque* translates it. The same *Evagrius* relates how this preserved a Jewish Child, who had thus communicated with Christian Children, from a burning Furnace into which his Father had cast him out of malice to the Communion he received, God vouchsafing to confirm this Communion under one Kind by so famous a Miracle. None ever thought of saying they erred in giving the Body without the Blood, or that such a Communion was in any respect defective.

The changing of this Custom was grounded on other Reasons as other matters of Discipline without a censure of the precedent Practice. So though this Custom or Practice hath ceased in the Church, yet it continues in Histories and Canons, by way of Testimony against the Protestants; the Communion of Infants is a clear Conviction of their Error: The lesser Infants communicate under the Species of Wine only, and those of riper years under that of Bread, both Practices equally demonstrating the Integrity of Communion under one Species only.

S E C T. IV:

THE THIRD CUSTOM.

Domestick, or Private Communion.

THe third Practice is that of the Faithful carrying home with them, after the Communion in the Church, the Holy *Eucharist* to communicate every day in their Houses. The *Species* of Wine was not given them as incapable of preservation, especially in so small a quantity as that which is used in the Holy Mysteries; and without doubt it was given them under the *Species* of Bread only. *Tertullian*, who mentions this Custom *Tert. de* in his Book *de Oratime*, speaks only of taking and keeping the *Orat. c. 14.* Body of our Lord: And in another place he speaks of the Bread which Christians eat fasting in secret, without the least mention of any thing else. *St. Cyprian* shows the same Practice *Lib. 2. ad* in his *Treatise de Lapsis*. This Custom, which began in the *48.5.* Times of Persecution, when the frequency of Christian Assemblies was molested, yet for other Reasons continued even in the peaceable Times.

We learn from *St. Basil*, that among the Hermites this was the only way of Communicating in the Wilderness or Deserts, *Basil. Ep. 239.* where there were no Priests. And 'tis yet certain, that these wonderful men not frequenting the Church, but at the chief Festivals, could not possibly preserve the *Species* of Wine. *St. Basil* also mentions nothing but something that was put into the hand to be carried to the mouth, that is to say, consecrated Bread; and this is that which they might reserve, as the same Father declares. To which he adds, that it is an indifferent thing to receive in the hand one, or many Particles; using a Word here, which in its common acceptation can import nothing but a Particle or Portion of something solid; whence *Aubertin* understands it only of the consecrated Bread. *Aubertin. 2. p. 442.* And tho' *St. Basil* shews, as well by these expressions, as by the whole

connexion or tenor of his Discourse, That the Faithful took, and reserved the Body only, in such occasions; yet he infers, their Communion was as effectual and entire in their Houses, as in their Churches. He saith also, This Custom was universal thro' all *Agypt*, even to *Alexandria*. Mr. *de la Roque* concludes very well from a Passage of St. *Hierom*, That it was also a custom at *Rome*, where, without going always to Church, the Faithful received every day the Body of our Lord at home: To which this Father adds, *Do we not receive the same Jesus Christ at home as we do in the publick Church?* to shew there is no difference in these Communions, as to their Effects, or Integrity.

The same Mr. *la Roque* confesseth, *The Primitive Christians sent the Holy Eucharist to one another as a Token of their Communion*; as in effect it is evident from a Letter of St. *Irenaeus*, That they sent it from *Rome* even to *Asia*; and moreover, that they carried it with them in their Voyages by Sea and Land: which confirms the Use of that *Species* which could be carried, which alone might be preserved so long in so small a quantity. As *Sayrus* St. *Ambrose's* Brother, who as the Saint relates, tho' as yet a Catechumen, or Novice in the Christian Religion, obtained thro' the fervor of his Faith, *this divine Sacrament, wrapp'd it up in a Linen Cloth, and tying it about his Neck; cast himself into the Sea together with this dear Pledge, by which means he also escaped the danger of the Seas.* I need not produce here the other Passages that confirm this custom; since Mr. *la Roque* by acknowledging it, hath sav'd me the trouble: We find by those Passages he cites, how the Blessed Sacrament was carried (that is) in a little Coffer, or in a very clean piece of Linen. He finds some Footsteps of this custom in the time of Pope St. *Hormisdas*, that is, at the beginning of the sixth Age; and 'tis true that in this Pope's time a false report being spread abroad at *Thessalonica*, of a Persecution, the *Eucharist* was given to all the Faithful by Baskets-full for a long time. Those that distributed it, are not to be blamed for giving it after this manner, but for their malicious frightening the People with a Report of an imaginary Persecution.

Truly, we ought not to look on this manner of communion at home, as an abuse upon a pretence the Practice was not continued: for in pure matters of Discipline, as this is, 'tis the Right

1 Part. c.
14 p. 173

Hier. ad
Pamm.

Hist. Euc.
1. P. c. 15.
p. 176.

Amb. de
obser. Fr.
Sat. T. 4.
1. Part. c.
12 p. 159.
c. 14.

Joan. Mos.
Prax. Spir.
T. xiii. B.
PP. p.
1089,
Inter ep.
Horm. Pap.
post ep. 62.
Sugg. Ger.
U post ep.
67. Ind.
Jo. Episc.
T. V. Cont.

Right of Holy Church for particular Reasons, to prohibit at one time, what she allows at another. 'Tis in Persecution-times, that is, in the most holy times, these customs have been generally used; thus the communion under one Kind, is authorised by the constant Practice of the best of times, and by the Example of all the Martyrs. 'Tis also clear, That in such times they communicated oftner under the *Species* of Bread only, than under both *Species*, since it was an established custom to take the Communion every day at home under that *Species* only, whereas both *Species* were not to be received, but in Church-Assemblies, which were not so common in those days; and none ever dreamt, during the Series of so many Ages, of any defect or imperfection in either of these ways.

Those who understand how much Veneration they bore to holy things in those days, will not look on it as unseemingly, or disrespectful to deliver the Communion into the hands of the Faithful, or to allow them the carrying it to their particular Homes, where to our shame and confusion was more Modesty than is to be met with in our Church in these days.

'Tis known also what mighty care the Christians took to keep the sacred Treasure of the Body of our Lord; but especially in concealing it from prophane hands. We see in the Acts of the Martyrs of *Nicomedia*, when the Magistrates visited the Chamber where St. *Domna* lived with the Eunuch *Indesher* Servant, *they found only a Cross, the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, the two Mats spread upon the bare ground, which were the Beds of these Martyrs, an earthen Censer, a Lamp, a little wooden Box, wherein they placed the holy Oblation which they received; but no Oblation, no Holy Eucharist could be found, which was that they looked for.* Let the Protestants now tell us what these Martyrs did with this Cross or Censer: Catholics are satisfied in this Point, and are transported to see amongst the Goods of these Saints with the Primitive Simplicity, the marks of their Religion, and of the Honour which was then given to the *Holy Eucharist*. But that which is much for our present purpose, we see in this History how the *Eucharist* was kept, and how careful they were to prevent its falling into the hands of Infidels. God himself was sometime concern'd in this Point, and the Acts of St. *Tharsicius* an *Acolyte*, shew how this holy Martyr being met by Pagans, whilst he was carry-

ing the Blessed Sacrament of the Body of our Lord, would never discover what he carried, and was destroyed with Sticks and Stones; after which, when these Infidels searched him, they could not either in his Hands or in his Cloths meet with the least Particle of the Sacrament of Jesus Christ, God himself taking a particular care of these heavenly Gifts. Those who know the Style of these times, confess it in those Acts, where mention is made of the Sacraments of Jesus Christ, and of the Sacraments of his Body. They used this Word *Sacrament* indifferently, either in the Plural or Singular Number, in speaking of the *Eucharist*, sometime to express the perfect Unity, and sometime to shew there were in one Sacrament alone, and in one sole Mystery (for these are convertible Terms) and even in each Particle of this adorable Sacrament, many Sacraments, and many Mysteries together.

This reserving or keeping of the *Holy Eucharist* under the sole Species of Bread in particular or private houses, confirms the Belief of keeping it in Churches, or at the Bishops houses, for the benefit of the sick; and such Practices which mutually support each other, clear the Doctrine of *Holy Church*, even above the degree of Disputes.

Hist. Euch. The Ministers Answers in this case serve only to shew their confusion in this Point. They all unanimously condemn this custom as a Prophanation and Abuse, after their allowing it universal for many Ages; and what is yet stranger, even in the purest times of Christianity. This Answer refutes it self, and will be easily allowed, since the whole business is, to know, whether all the Martyrs were prophane persons, or the Ministers, their Accusers, bold and temerarious.

Cal.n. 11. Calixtus, and Mr. du Bourdieu, who follows him in all things, mention two Canons of the Church of Spain, one of the Council of Saragoza, the other of the first Council of Toledo; by which, those who swallow not the Eucharist from the hands of the Bishop, are to be look'd on as sacrilegious and excommunicated persons.

1. c. 14. T. Mr. de la Roque's Answer to them, is, That he doth not believe the Canon of Saragoza was made to abolish the custom of carrying away the *Eucharist*, and of keeping it. The same he urgeth as to the first Council of Toledo; and he takes his Argument from the eleventh Canon of the eleventh Council that was held in the same place.

Hist. Euc.
1. P. ch. 14.
p. 174.
Conc. Tol.
XI. c. XI.
XVI. Conc.

And

And setting aside the Opinion of *Mr. de la Roque*, 'tis manifest, these two Councils held in the fourth Age, or thereabouts, could not detest a custom as sacrilegious, which by the Testimony of the Fathers, was common in those times, as we have shewed from the confession of the Ministers themselves.

In fine, These Councils mention nothing of those, who receiving in the Church a part of the consecrated Bread, reserve another part for private or domestick Communion; but they relate to those, who, receiving the Communion from the Bishop's hands, swallowed none at all. See here, what these Councils prohibit, and 'tis easie to guess the Motives of this their Prohibition; since the first Council of *Toledo*, which by its Thirteenth Canon is so severe against those who affected in assisting at the Church, never to communicate there; when in the following Canon, it condemns, as Persons guilty of Sacrilege, those who swallow not the Communion after they have received it from the hand of the Priest, makes it sufficiently clear by this connexion, That its Design was to censure another manner of avoiding the Communion, which was so much the worse, because it look'd either like a sacrilegious piece of Hypocrisie, or too open an aversion to this Sacred Mystery.

These wretched people, who so obstinately avoided the Communion, were the *Priscillianists*, certain Hereticks of those times and places there, who usually mix'd themselves with the Faithful. But if they reject this for the Motive of that Canon, they must confess there were other evil Motives which oblig'd them not to swallow the *Holy Eucharist*, which were liable to be condemned in these Councils. One may abstain from the *Eucharist* out of Superstition, he may keep it with a Design to abuse it, or reject it out of pure Infidelity; and the Eleventh Council of *Toledo* tells us, such a kind of Sacrilege was condemned in the first. These, and such like Abuses, taken notice of in certain places, might occasion local Prohibitions: and 'tis yet certain, That what is practis'd reverentially in one place, and at one time, may be so ill practis'd in another time and place, as to be look'd on as sacrilegious: Therefore take these Canons how you will, they do not any ways authorise their Errors, who would make the Practices of the *Holy Martyrs*, and of the whole *Primitive Church*, pass for an Abuse,

and have no other way to come off, but by such a Censure.

epi.c.18. Mr. *du Bourdieu* would save himself by another Evasion, as frivolous as the former. He would willingly persuade the world, the Faithful communicated even at home under both *Species*, and reserved them both; for which he brings, after *Calixtus*, four Testimonies: That of *St. Justin*, who saith, After consecration in the Church, the Deacons carried the two *Species* to them that were absent: That of *St. Gregory the Great*, who *Greg. Dial. 3. c. 136.* relates, That in a Voyage from *Rome* to *Constantinople*, and in a great Tempest, the Faithful received both the Body and the Blood; That of *Amphilochius*, who in the Life of *St. Basil*, saith, A Jew mixing himself with the Faithful in their Assembly, carried home to his own House some of the Remainders of the Body and Blood: And lastly, That of *Gregory Nazianzen*, who relates how his Sister, *St. Gorgonia*, mix'd with her tears what she could gather up of the *Species or Symbols of the Body and Blood*; he should have translated it according to the Text, of the Body or the Blood, and not, of the Body and the Blood, as he hath purposely done, to insinuate to the world, both the one and the other were reserv'd together.

The two first of these four Examples are clearly impertinent to our present purpose. We have already shewed, with *Mr de la Roque*, That in the Example of *St. Justin*, both *Species* indeed were carried, but immediately after their being consecrated, from which we cannot strictly infer they kept them; which is precisely our Question.

To prove that in the Passage of *St. Gregory*, The Faithful kept both *Species in their Vessel from Rome to Constantinople*, we are to be sure there was no Priest in this Vessel who might celebrate; or that *Maximian*, whom *St. Gregory* mentions in this place, was none, tho' the Superior of a Monastery. This great Pope omits these circumstances, and leaves us the liberty of supplying them by other Reasons, of which the chief is taken from that impossibility already so often remarked, of keeping so small a quantity of consecrated Wine so long a time.

What *Mr. du Bourdieu* says here on this occasion (*viz.*) That they durst not celebrate on shipboard, shews only his Inclinations to cavil, without so much as reflecting, that even at this day, we celebrate in all places when there is reason for it.

it. Thus of four Examples, two, you see, are altogether frivolous. The two other, with the Passages of *Baronius*, and the learned *Aubespinus* Bishop of *Orleans*, with which they guard them, may very well prove, the Blood was not refused to the Faithful, to carry home with them, if they desired; for why should they refuse it them, or believe the Sacred Body, with which they were entrusted, was more precious than his Blood? but they can never prove they could keep it any considerable time, since Nature it self opposed it, or that it was the Custom to do it, the Church being satisfied, the Communion was the same under one or both Kinds. We find also, *St. Gregory* saith not, *his Sister bedewed the Body and Blood with her tears*, as if he certainly had both; but the *Body*, or the *Blood*, to shew he knew which she kept, it being the usual custom to reserve the *Body* only.

Why then should they cavil at so constant a practice? Truth should always prevail; and *Mr. de la Roque*, who hath been most curious in this Matter, ingenuously acknowledgeth, The Faithful carried home the Bread of the *Eucharist*, to take it when they would, defending himself as well as he can from the consequence, by observing, as he thinks, this abusive and particular Custom cannot any ways prejudice the general Practice; and that even those who carried the *Eucharist* home, probably did it not, till they had first eaten a part in the Assembly, and participated of the Chalice of our Lord.

Hist. Eur.
1. P. c. 12.
p. 159.

Calixtus defends himself almost with the same Answer. At the beginning of his Treatise of *Communion in both Kinds*, he had ingenuously acknowledged, That some reserved the sacred Bread to eat at home, or on their Journey; and after many Passages, that of *St. Basil*, which admits of no Evasion, being one of them, he had concluded it certain, That some out of a religious affection to the *Eucharist*, carried away with them a part of the consecrated Bread, or holy Symbols. No one, even by these Passages in *Calixtus* himself, can be ignorant, that these whom he so smoothly calleth *some*, are the whole Church: And when he adds, That this Custom was tolerated some time, his *some time* is four or five hundred years of the best and purest Ages; and his toleration here, is nothing but an universal reception of a Custom even in the fairest and most unblemished Ages of the Church, without the least Censure from any one.

Calixtus,

Calixtus, in the following part of his Discourse, is angry ; and does all he can to prove by Examples already refuted, that this Communion might be under both Kinds. But he flies back again to his first Solution, *That the Faithful, who communicated under the Species of Bread only at home, had received that of Wine in the Church, and that for a thousand, or eleven hundred years of Publick Communion under one Kind.* As if 'twere not enough to convince him, That Communion under one Kind had been judged perfect and sufficient ; or that it was allowed to communicate under one Kind, contrary to Jesus Christ's Institution, at home, tho' not in the Church : Or in fine, as if the Particle of Bread consecrated, which was taken at home, was not given at the Church it self, and by the hands of the Pastours, for that use.

Behold the idle Cavils of these Ministers, by which they would elude a Truth that is as manifest as if it were written with the Beams of the Sun : But I will not suffer them to continue in an Error, even as to publick Communion ; and tho' this private Communion, approved by the whole Church, makes enough for us, yet we shall presently see that Communion under one Kind was equally in the solemn and publick Assemblies, as in private Houses.

S E C T. V.

THE FOURTH CUSTOM.

Communion at the Church, and at the Ordinary Office.

THIS I lay down therefore as the Fourth Practice, That in the Church, and in the publick Assemblies of Christians, it was permitted, or allowed, to receive either one or both *Species*. The *Manicheans* abhorred Wine as a Creature of the Devil; besides, they denied that the Son of God shed his Blood for our Redemption, looking on his Passion as a meer Phantom and Illusion: On these two Reasons they entertained an aversion for the precious Blood of our Lord, which was received in the holy Mysteries under the *Species* of Wine only: And as St. Leo saith, *the better to conceal themselves, and to spread their Doctrine with greater ease, they mixed themselves with Catholics, even to communicate with them; yet they received the Body of our Lord only, refusing to drink the Blood by which we were redeemed.* This crafty proceeding of theirs could hardly be discovered, since all Catholics themselves communicated not under both *Species*. At the last 'twas taken notice of, that these Hereticks did it thro' affectation; so that the holy Pope, St. Leo the Great, was for Excommunicating all, that were discovered by this Mark. And St. Gelasius, his Disciple and Successor, was obliged to forbid expressly the communicating any other ways than under both *Species*: An Argument it was indifferent before, and that this Ordinance would not have been thought on, but to prevent the deceit and hypocrisie of the *Manicheans*.

Leo I.
Serm. 45.
which is
the 42d.
de Euch.

In Dec.
Grat. de
Const. Dis.

This was in the fifth Age. Mr. de la Roque and others relate it with the Opinion of these two Popes, and take advantage of it. But on the contrary, from this practice we see clearly there were wanting particular Reasons to oblige the

I. Par. c.
12. p. 144.

Faith.

Faithful to a necessity of communicating under both Kinds, and that it was held indifferent before; otherwise the Manicheans would have discovered themselves too much beyond all hopes of being tolerated.

But, say the Ministers, if it were allowed at any time to communicate under the Species of Bread only, the Manicheans might have continued thus undistinguished or undiscovered: As if there were no difference betwixt a liberty to receive one or both Kinds, and the constant affectation of these Hereticks obstinately to refuse the consecrated Wine. Strange effect of Prejudice to fight against so palpable and plain a Truth!

'Tis true, upon supposition of this Liberty being allowed, these Hereticks could not be distinguished from the Faithful, without much time, and no less diligence. And this is also the reason why their deceit continued so long concealed, and that which produced at last in St. Gelasius's time, a necessity of communicating in both Kinds, under pain of being deprived of them both.

Ibid. p. 283 Mr. du Bourdieu cunningly conceals here the Motive that induced this Pope to put out that Prohibition. The words of the Decree are these; *We have discovered, that some persons in taking the Sacred Body only, abstain from the Holy Chalice, who (because they seem to follow, I know not what Superstition) let them either communicate under both Kinds, or let them be deprived as well of one, as the other.* This because of Pope Gelasius, which clearly shews that their superstitious Abstinence, was the true Reason he obliged them to both Kinds, is industriously omitted by this Minister: For see what he makes this Pope say: *I know not what Superstition they are addicted to; either let them receive the Sacraments entire, or let them be deprived of the entire Sacraments.*

Qui proculdubio (quoniam nescio quæ superstitione videntur astringi) aut integra Sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur.
Gel. ibid.

He took care to let that Particle appear in his Translation, by which this Pope expressed the particular Motive of his Prohibition, for fear it might make against him, that nothing was more free than Communion without receiving the Blood, since particular Reasons or Occasions were requisite to oblige the doing of it.

There is another piece of Subtilty, but weak enough, in the translation of this Minister: For in stead of what the Pope saith, as I even now translated it, *which persons truly, because they seem*

to adhere to I know not what Superstition, that is to say, some certain Superstition indefinitely, which he will not vouchsafe to express; this Minister makes him say, more precisely, and more strongly: *I know not what Superstition they are addicted to*, that he might conclude in his following Discourse, that this touched not the *Manicheans*, *Whose Errors*, saith he, *this learned Bishop was not ignorant of, nor of those of his time.*

*Nescio qua
superstitione
videntur
adstringi.*

*Du Bourd.
ib. p. 285.*

Calixtus endeavoured before him to distinguish the Prohibition of *St. Leo* from that of *St. Gelasius*, to prevent the Opinion of this last Pope's Decree, having a relation to the Errors of the *Manicheans*. What signifieth this pitiful Refuse to him? Since by the terms of this Decree, 'tis evident it had some particular Motive, what signifieth it whether it were the *Manichean* Heresie, or any other? And is not this enough to let us see (take it which way you will) that the Church must have some particular Reasons to oblige them to both Kinds?

But in the main, 'tis not to be doubted, but that which *St. Gelasius* mentions, was that of the *Manicheans*; since *Anastasius* the Librarian-keeper in the Life of this great Pope, expressly saith, He discovered the *Manicheans* at *Rome*, banish'd them, and burnt their Books before *St. Maries Church*. Moreover, what Superstition, except the *Manichean*, could have inspired such an aversion to Wine, or to the Sacred Blood of our Lord? Besides, 'tis clear these Hereticks had strange kind of Artifices to insinuate themselves secretly into the company of the Faithful, and their erroneous Discourses so prevalent, that the impressions they made in the minds of the Faithful, were not to be blotted out without great difficulty. 'Tis clear then, these superstitious People, whom Pope *St. Gelasius* mentions, were the secret Remainers of those *Manicheans* *St. Leo* his Predecessor discovered thirty or forty years before: And whereas *St. Gelasius* said, *They are addicted to I know not what Superstition*, 'twas not that he was ignorant of their Errors; but it was an Expression of Contempt, or rather from the various shapes of that obscure and shifting Heresie, which never discovered all its Poison to the People at once, nor appeared altogether bare-fac'd in its own colours.

*Vi. Gel. T.
IV. Conc.*

But see! the last Refuge of these Ministers. They say we are out in looking for a particular Reason of *St. Gelasius's* Decree,

case, since he manifestly grounds it on the Nature of the Mystery. Let us once more produce the words of this Pope, with their whole consequence: *He hath discovered, saith he, that some persons take only the Sacred Body, and abstain from the sacred Blood, which persons truly (because they seem so adhere to I know not what Superstition,) let them take both parts, or let them be deprived of both, because the division of one and the same Mystery cannot be without the guilt of Sacrilege.*

To understand well the consequence of these words, we see the division he condemns as Sacrilegious, was grounded on the fore-mentioned Superstition, by which the precious Blood of our Lord, consecrated under the *Species* of Wine, was looked on as an object of aversion. This is to divide the Mystery truly, to believe there is one part of it not of Jesus Christ's Institution, and therefore to be rejected as abominable. But to believe Jesus Christ equally instituted both parts, and yet to take but one, not out of a contempt of the other, which God forbid; but because we believe the virtue of both contained in either, and that in them both there is but one sole Foundation of Grace. If this is dividing the Holy Mystery, the Primitive Church divided it in the Communion of the Sick, Communion of little Children, and generally of all the Faithful at home under one Kind. But as we dare not entertain such an Opinion of the Primitive Church, we must necessarily assert, That to divide this Mystery, something else must be believed and practised, besides what is believ'd and practised by all Catholics.

S E C T. VI.

The Mass of Holy Friday, and that of the Pre-sanctified.

TH E Primitive Church was so far from believing the Communion under one Kind a dividing of the Myſtery, that ſhe ſet aſide certain ſolemn days, on which ſhe gave the Sacred Body of our Lord only in the Church to all the Aſſiſtants. Such was the Office of *Good Friday* in the *Latin Church*; and ſuch was that of every day in *Lent* in the *Greek Church*, except *Saturday* and *Sunday*.

To begin with the *Latin Church*, we ſee in the *Ordo Romanus*, in *Aluinus*, or in that ancient Author, whole Explication of this Book we have under his own name in *Amalarus*, in *Abbot Rupert*, in *Hugo de Sancto Victore*, (what we practice even to this very day, that on *Good Friday* they conſecrated not, but reſerved for that days Communion, the Body of our Lord that was conſecrated the day before, and received it on *Good Friday* in unconſecrated Wine. We expreſſly note by all theſe places, that the Body only was reſerved without the Blood; the reaſon of which is (ſaith *Hugo de Sancto Victore*,) That under each Species Body and Blood are both received, and that the Species of Wine cannot well be kept. This laſt reaſon we meet with in one of the Editions of *Amalarus*, which is equally his with the others, this Author having often reviewed his Book, ſeveral of which we have ſeen in our days. The like we may ſay of *Janus* Biſhop of *Orleans*, and many others, and without inſiſting on theſe Criticiſms, tis clear after *Amalarus*, after many myſtical Reaſons which he produceth for this Cuſtom, with ſeveral other Authors, we may more ſincerely ſay, the conſecrated Wine is not reſerved, becauſe more obnoxious to alteration than the Bread; which in ſhort confirms what we have produced, as to the Communion of the Sick under the Species of Bread on-

*Bib. P. P.
Var. T. de
Div. off.*

*Hug. de S.
Fid. erud.
Theol. l. 3.
c. 20.*

ly, and shews clearly, the *Eucharist*, which was constantly reserved for them for many days, according to the holy intention of the Church, could not be kept for them under the *Species* of Wine, since they were apprehensive of an alteration in one day or two, that is, from *Thursday* to *Good Friday*.

I might here also observe, That the Church was not only zealous for the preventing the corruption of the *Species*, which might change the Nature and necessary Matter of the Sacrament, but even the least-alteration in them, being willing, out of a Veneration to this Blessed Sacrament, that every thing in it should be pure, and suitable to so great a Mystery, wherein Jesus Christ was himself to be the Banquet. But these Remarks, as little necessary to our present subject, are fitter for another place; and 'tis sufficient to see here, that they reserved then, as we do now, nothing but the Sacred Body for the Service on *Good Friday*.

And yet 'tis clear from all the Authors, and all the Passages we even now quoted, the Priest, the whole Clergy, and all the People communicated this holy day, and consequently under one *Species* only. This Custom is most visible in the *Gallican Church*, most of these Authors being Members of it, so that we ought to have a particular Veneration for it; but to say, a Custom so strongly established in the Eighth Age, had no higher a beginning, is too palpable an absurdity. We cannot trace its Origine or Rise; so that if we admit the Opinion of Communion under one *Species* being sacrilegious, we must say the Primitive Church chose *Good Friday* (the day of our Blessed Saviour's Death) on purpose to prophane a Mystery, which was instituted in memory of it. Thus also they communicated on *Easter Eve*, since on the one side, 'tis clear by the consent of all Authors, *Good Friday* and *Easter Eve* were Communion-days for all the People; and on the other, as clear, they did not Sacrifice during these two days: Whence even at this very day we have no proper Mass in our Missal for *Easter Eve*. So that they communicated under the *Species* of Bread only, which was kept from *Holy Thursday*; and if we must believe our Reformers, they prepared themselves for a Paschal Communion by two Sacrilegious ones.

The Monks of *Clugny*, as holy as they were, were as guilty *Cont.*
in this point as others; and the Book of their Customs, once *Chun. J. 1.*
already cited in this Discourse, shews that six hundred years *c. 13. de*
ago they communicated, even in that holy time, under one *Parus. T.* 4.
Species only.

These things sufficiently set forth the Universal Custom of the *Latin* Church. But the *Greeks* go yet farther: They do not consecrate on *Fasting days*, from a *Decorum* of not confounding the joy and solemnity of the Sacrifice with the sadness of a Fast. Whence in *Lent* time, they do not consecrate but on *Sundays* and *Saturdays*, on which they fast not. On other days they offer the Sacrament reserved on those two solemn days, which they call the Imperfect Mass, on the Mass of the Presanctified, because the *Eucharist* they offer in these days was consecrated or sanctified the two precedent days; and in the Mass they call Perfect.

The antiquity of this Custom cannot be denied, since we *Conc.*
meet with it in the Sixth Age in the Council of *Trullo*, where *Trull. c. 52.*
we see the Foundation of it from the Fourth Age in the Council of *Laodicea*; and nothing is more remarkable amongst the *Greeks* than this Mass of the Presanctified. *Conc. Laod. c. 49, 51.*

If we would know at present, what it is they offer there, 'tis but looking o'er the ancient Liturgies of the Presanctified in their *Euchologes*, and in *Bibliotheca Patrum*; and we shall there see they reserved nothing but the sacred Bread: 'Tis the sacred Bread they carry from the *Sacristy*; 'tis the sacred Bread they elevate, adore, and offer Incense to; it is the sacred Bread they mix, without the preface of any Prayer, with unconsecrated Wine and Water, and which in fine they distribute to the People. So that all the *Lent*, the holiest time of the year, five days of the Week they communicated under the *Species* of Bread only. *Euch. Grav. Bib. P. P. Paris. T. II.*

We know not upon what ground some of the *Latins* have undertaken to condemn this Custom of the *Greeks*, which neither Popes nor Councils ever censured; on the contrary, the *Latin* Church having observed this Custom on *Good Friday*, 'tis clear this Office, with the manner of its Communion, is become Sacred by the Tradition even of both Churches.

What

What is more remarkable, is, That tho' it is so clear, the *Greeks* receive nothing on these days, but the Body of our Lord; yet they change nothing in their usual Formularies. The sacred Gifts are always named in the plural, and in their Prayers they no less mention the Body and the Blood: So firmly is it fixed in the minds of Christians, that one *Species* cannot be received, without receiving at the same time, not only the Virtues, but even the Substance of both.

This true, the modern *Greeks* explain themselves other ways, and seem not generally so fond of Communion under one Kind: but in this the force of Truth is more visible, since in despite of them, their own Customs, their own Liturgies, their own Traditions condemn them.

But is it not true, will some say, That they drop some of the precious Blood in the form of a Cross, on the Particles of the sacred Body, which they keep for the following days, and for the Office of the Profanities? This true; but it is true at the same time, that this is a new Custom amongst them; and that in conclusion, to examine it thoroughly, it makes nothing against us.

It makes nothing against us, because, besides two or three drops of consecrated Wine cannot be kept any long time; the *Greeks* take care, immediately after their dropping them on the consecrated Bread, to dry it on a Chafin dish, and to reduce it to powder, for thus they keep it, as well for the sick, as for the Office of the Profanities. A clear Evidence the Authors of this Tradition, by this mixture, had no respect to Communion under both Kinds, which they would have given otherwise if they had believed them necessary; but rather used it as an explication of some Mystery, such as the Resurrection of our Lord, which all Liturgies, *Greek* and *Latin*, figure to us, by the mixture of the Body and the Blood in the Chalice, because since the Death of our Lord was by effusion of his precious Blood, this mixture of his Body and Blood is very proper to represent how this Man-God rose from death to life again.

I should blush to produce here all the frivolous subtilties of the modern *Greeks*; with their false reasonings about the Wine, its grosser or more substantial Parts remaining, after the solid

Bodies,

Bolus, with which Wine may be mixed, because they ; whence they conclude the same is done in the species of consecrated Wine ; and by this means the Blood of our Lord may remain in the consecrated Bread, after its being dried in the Chafing-dish. By these fine reasonings the Lees and the Tartar must still be Wine, and consequently fit for the Holy Eucharist. Will the Mysteries of Jesus Christ admit of such sort of reasonings ? 'Twas Wine, vulgarly called so, that is, a liquid and flowing Wine, Jesus Christ instituted for his Sacrament. It is a Liquor which he hath given us to represent to our eyes his Blood which was shed ; and the Simplicity of the Gospel will not allow these Subtilties of the modern Greeks.

We must also acknowledge it a Novelty amongst them, and that the custom of dropping the consecrated Wine on the Bread of the Eucharist, was not heard of before their Schism. The Patriarch Michael Cerularius, who may pass for the true Author of this Schism, yet, in a Book he composed in defence of the Office of the Profanotified, writes, *That the sacred Bread, Synod. Icon which are believed to be, and effectually are, the quickning Body of Pand. Guil. our Lord, ought to be kept for his Sanctification, without the least drop of the previous Blood on them.* And in the Notes of a famous Berer. Ox. on. 1672. Canonist on the Councils, a Clergyman of the Church of Constantinople, wherein he expressly observes, *That according to Conc. Trul. the Doctrine of blessed John (Patriarch of Constantinople,) the T. 2. p. 156. previous Blood must not be sprinkled on the Profanotified they would refuse; and this, said he, is the practice of our Church.* So let Leo All. ex. id Nihil. these modern Greeks say what they will, this inbature is expressly against their Tradition ; and by consent of their own 1. P. 6. Authors, and force of their own Tradition, there is not the least pretence or umbrage for them to defend the necessity of 2. 2. 7. 6. both Kinds in the Mysteries Profanotified.

For who can understand what the Patriarch Michael saith in his Works by us newly quoted, That the Wine, in which they mix the Body reserved, is changed into the precious Blood by this mixing, without so much as any previous sanctifying Prayers, that is, without the words of Consecration, (be they what they will) as it appears by the Eucharist's, and Michael's own Confession ? Strange and unheard of Doctrine ! that a

Sacrament may be made without words, contrary to the Scriptures, the constant Tradition of all Churches, which neither *Greeks*, nor any else ever called in question.

The greater Reverence then we pay the old Traditions of the *Grecians*, which are derived to them from their Fathers, and those times wherein they were united to us; the more we ought to despise those Errors they are fallen into since, when weakened and blinded with Schism. 'Twill be impertinent to name them, since Protestants themselves allow them to be very great: But to do Justice to the modern *Greeks*, I will only say, they are not all tainted with this gross Opinion of *Michael*, and that it is not an Universal Opinion amongst them, The Wine, without any particular Benediction, (contrary to Scripture and Tradition) is changed into the Blood by this mixture only.

Much less are we to believe, the *Latins*, who even now expounded to us the Office of *Good Friday*, could be guilty of this Error, since they express quite contrary; and to omit nothing that may help to clear the Point, we must again in few words produce their Sentiments.

'Tis true then, we find in the *Ordo Romanus*, and in the Office of *Good Friday*, That the consecrated Wine is sanctified by the sanctified Bread, which is mixed with it. This also we meet with in *Alcuinus* and *Amalarius* on the Divine Office. But by the least reflexion on their Doctrine in these Books, we must confess this sanctification of unconsecrated Wine by the mixture of the Body of our Lord, cannot be the Consecration by which the Wine is turned into the Blood, but an inferior Kind of a Sanctification: Such as *St. Bernard* speaks of, when he says, The Wine mixed with the consecrated Host, shd not consecrated, by that solemn and particular Benediction, which changes it into the Blood of *Jesus Christ*, becomes yet sacred by touching the sacred Body of our Lord, but in a different manner, from what is performed, according to this Saint, by the words taken out of the Gospel.

Alcuinus is express herein, when expounding the Canon of the Mass, as we have it to this day, when he comes to the place where we pronounce the Sacramental Words, which are those of *Jesus Christ* himself, *This is my Body, This is my Blood;* He

*Alc. de div.
offic.
Amal. l. 1.
de div. offic.
Bib. PP.
de div. off.
Bern. ep.
69. p. 92.*

He saith, These are the words by which they consecrated the Bread and the Chalice in the beginning, and by which they are consecrated at present, and by which they shall ever be consecrated, because *JESUS CHRIST* by the mouth of his Priests, pronouncing still his own Words, maketh his own Body and his own Blood present by a celestial Benediction. And *Amalarius* on the same place of the Canon, is as clear, That in this place, and by the pronounciation of these words, *The nature of the Bread and Wine is changed into the nature of the Body and Blood of JESUS CHRIST;* and he had said a little before particularly of the consecration of the Chalice, That one simple Liquor by the Priest's Benediction was changed into the Blood of our Lord: which shews how far he and *Alcuinus* were from believing the mixing them only without any words, could produce this effect. When therefore they say, *The pure Wine is sanctified by the mixture of the Body of Jesus Christ,* 'tis clear enough, they mean, That by touching the Holy of Holies, this Wine is sanctified: but that it should become the Sacrament of Jesus Christ, and be changed into his Blood, without pronouncing the words of Jesus Christ upon it, is an Error altogether inconsistent with the tenor of their Doctrine.

*Amal. l. III.
24. ibid.*

Lib. I. 12.

All who have writ of the Divine Office, and of that of the Mass, use the same Language with both these Authors.

Isaac Bishop of *Langres*, their Contemporary, in his Explanation of the Canon, and of the place where they consecrate, saith, The Priest having done thitherto all he could, in order to the doing of something more wonderful, borrows the Words of *JESUS CHRIST* himself; that is, these words, *This is my Body: Powerful Words,* saith he, *to which the Lord gives his Virtue;* according to the expression of the Psalmist, Word which are always effectual, since the Word who is the Power of God, saith and doth all at the same time: so that here is made by these Words, contrary to all humane Reason, a new nourishment for a new man, a new Jesus born of the Spirit, an Host descended from Heaven; and what follows, which is nothing to our Subject; this being clear enough to shew this great Bishop placed Consecration in the Words of our Saviour.

*Isaac Ling.
Spicil. T. I.
p. 351.*

Remigius Bishop of *Auxerre*, in a Book he composed, of the Mass, towards the end of the Ninth Age, is clearly of the same judgment with *Alcuinus*, since he only transcribed word for word, all that part of his Book where this Matter is handled.

Hild. cod.
F.B. PP.

Hilbertus Bishop of *Mans*, famous for Piety, Eloquence and Learning, so much extolled by the *Protestants* themselves, for the Praises he gave *Berengarius*; after his conversion, or pretended conversion from his Errors, expressly affirms, The Priest consecrates, not by his own Words, but by those of *Jesus Christ*; and then under the Sign of the Cross, and those Words, the Nature is changed: the Bread honours the Altar in becoming his Body, and the Wine in becoming his Blood: whence the Priest at that time is obliged to elevate the Bread and the Wine, to shew thereby they are elevated to a higher Nature than what they were.

Rup. de
divin. Off.
l. II. c. 9.
U l. V. c.
20.
Hug. de S.
vis. eru.
Theo. l. III.
c. 20.

The Abbot *Rupertus* saith the same; and after him *Hugo de Saincto Victore*. We find all these Books heaped together in *Bibliotheca Patrum*, in that Tome *De Divinis Officiis*.

We find this Tradition so constant, especially in the *Latin Church*, that its contrary cannot be imagined to be found in the *Ordo Romanus*, or that *Alcuinus* and *Amalarius*, without explaining themselves so clearly, as we see they have, could so much as entertain a thought of it. But this Tradition is of a higher Rise. Before these many *French* Authors I have cited, there was a Bishop of the *Gallicane Church*, who said, in the Fifth Age, That the Creatures placed on the holy Altars, and blessed by these celestial Words, ceased to be the Substance of Bread and Wine, and became the Body and Blood of our Lord; and before him, St. *Ambrose* understood by these *Celestial Words*, the proper Words of *Jesus Christ*, This is my Body, This is my Blood; adding, That the consecration of the Body as well as of the Blood, was done by the words of our Lord. And the Author of the Book of Sacraments, suppose it

Eus. Gal.
five Euch.
T. 6. Max.
Bibl. PP.
Tom. V. de
Pasch.
Amb. de in.
c. 9.

Amb. l. IV.
Sac. c. 5.

Iren. l. IV.
34.

Just. ap. 2.

St. *Ambrose*, or one of his Contemporaries, who follows him in all things (for all his Antiquity) speaks the same thing; and all the Fathers of that time speak after this manner; and before them St. *Irenaeus* taught, the ordinary Bread was made the *Eucharist* by the Invocation of God made over it: and St. *Justin*, whom he frequently quotes, said before him, That the *Eucharist* was made by the Prayer of the Word which came from

from Jesus Christ, and that by this word, the ordinary food which usually nourisheth our Flesh and Blood, became the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, that was incarnated for us. And before all these Fathers, the Apostle St. Paul clearly observed the particular Benediction of the Chalice, when he said, *The Chalice of Benediction which we bless.* And to come to the Head, or Original, Jesus Christ consecrateth the Wine, in saying, *This is my Blood*; as he consecrated the Bread in saying, *This is my Body*; so that no Man of sense can imagin the Church could believe, the Wine consecrated without Words by the mixture only with the Body; whence it is clear, our Fathers communicated under the *Species* of Bread only on *Good Friday*.

1 Cor 10.
16.

S E C T. VII.

*The Sentiments and Practice of these last Ages,
grounded on the Sentiments and Practice of the
Primitive Church.*

SO many constant Practices of the *Primitive Church*, so many different Circumstances whereby it is clear she gave the Communion under one Kind, privately and publicly, yet always with an universal approbation, and according to the established Canons; so many Ages before the Council of *Constance*, and from the beginning of Christianity, even to this very Council, do invincibly demonstrate, this Council follow'd only the Tradition of all Ages, in defining Communion under one Kind, as good and sufficient, as that under both; and which way soever it was taken, they neither contradicted Jesus Christ's Institution, nor cheated themselves of the Benefit of this Blessed Sacrament.

In things of this nature Holy Church hath always thought she had liberty to change her Laws, as Times and Circumstances might require; and therefore leaving Communion under one or both Kinds, as a thing indifferent; and afterwards on some particular Reasons obliging her Members to both; on other distinct Reasons she hath reduced them again to communion under one Kind, ready to give both when the Good of the Church shall require, as it appears by the Decrees of the Council of *Trent*.

*Sess. 21.
post Can.*

This Council, after having declar'd, That communion under both Kinds, was not necessary, proposeth to it self two Points to be treated of.

The first, Whether it be convenient to grant the Cup to any particular Nation?

The Second, On what conditions they may allow it.

They

They had an Instance of this Concession in the Council of *Basil*: by which the Cup was granted to the *Bohemians*, on condition they should acknowledge Jesus Christ was received whole and entire under each Kind; or that it was not necessary to receive both.

It was therefore much debated at *Trent*, Whether they should allow the same thing to *Germany* and *France*, who demanded it in order to the reducing the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*. In fine, the Council thought fit, for several important Reasons, to leave it to the Pope, that in this he might act according to his Prudence, what might be most advantageous for the state of Christendom, and most proper for their Salvation, who should ask it or require it. *Self. 22. in fine.*

In consequence of this Decree, and according to the example of *Paul* the Third, his Successor *Pius* the Fourth, at the Intreaty of *Ferdinand* the Emperor, and some other Princes of *Germany*, by his Briefs of the first of *September* 1563. sent a Permission to some Bishops to grant the Cup to the *Germans* on certain conditions expressed in these Briefs conformable to those of *Basil*, if they found it good for their Souls. This was accordingly put in execution at *Vienna*, in *Austria*, and in some other places. But they soon saw their minds were too much exasperated to profit any thing by this Remedy. The *Lutheran* Ministers sought for nothing but an occasion to insinuate to the People, That the Church confessed her self in an Error, whilst she believed the substance of the Blessed Sacrament was received entire under one Kind only: a thing clearly contrary to the Declaration she exacted; but blind Passion makes men prevaricate, undertake and believe any thing. So they ceased to make use of that Indulgence, or Concession the Pope prudently granted them, which perhaps at another time with better dispositions would have succeeded better.

Holy Church, which ought in all things to keep the Balance equal, ought not to make that seem indifferent, which is essential, or that essential which is indifferent, nor to change her Discipline, but for the manifest good of her Children; and from this prudent dispensation are derived all the Changes or Alterations we have observed in the administration of one or both Kinds.

The End of the First Part.



A
TREATISE
 OF THE
 HOLY COMMUNION
 UNDER
Both Kinds.

The SECOND PART.

*Principles on which the Practice and Judgment of
 the Church are established; which also the Pro-
 testants make use of as well as we.*

Such hath been the Practice of Holy Church. The Prin-
 ciples on which this Practice is grounded, are as certain
 as the Practice hath been constant.

So, to clear all Difficulties, I will not produce one Principle
 the Pretended Reformer can so much as question.

SECT.

S E C T. I.

FIRST PRINCIPLE.

Nothing indispensable in the Sacrament but what is essential.

THE first Principle I lay down, is, That in the Administration of Sacraments, we are not obliged to do all which Jesus Christ did, but only what is essential to them.

This is an undeniable Principle. The pretended Reformers dip not their Infants in the Water of Baptism, as St. *John* dipped Jesus Christ in the River *Jordan*, neither do they celebrate the Lords Supper at Table, or in Supper time, as Jesus Christ did; omitting many other things Christ himself observed.

But that which requires most our immediate consideration, is the Ceremony of Baptism, which may serve for a groundwork or Basis for many things in this nature.

To baptize signifieth to dip, in this all agree. This Ceremony is derived from the Purifications of the *Jews*; and as amongst them, the most perfect Purification consisted in a total dipping of themselves in Water, Jesus Christ, who came to sanctifie and fulfil the old Ceremonies, chose this as the most proper, and most significant, to express the remission of sins, and the regeneration of the new man.

The Baptism of St. *John*, which was as a preparative to that of Jesus Christ, was performed by dipping.

The vast number of People which resorted to this Baptism, occasioned St. *John* to choose the Borders of *Jordan*, and particularly the Country of *Aenon*, near *Salim*, because of the great plenty of Water there, and the great facility of dipping those who came to offer or consecrate themselves to Penance by this holy Ceremony.

Matth. 3.

5, 6.

Luke 3. 3.

Job. 3. 23.

When

When Jesus Christ came to St. *John* ; to render Baptism more glorious and wonderful , by his own receiving it, Scripture saith, *He ascended out of the Waters of Jordan* , to shew he was wholly dipped. Matth. 3.
16.
Mark 1.
10.
Acts 3.41.
4.4.

There is no evidence in the *Acts of the Apostles*, the three thousand, and the five thousand converted by St. *Peter's* Sermons, were baptized any other way ; and the number of these Profelites, is no Argument they were baptized by sprinkling, as some would have it. For, not to insist on their not being baptized all on one day, 'tis clear St. *John Baptist* , who baptized as many, since all *Judea* flocked to him, yet baptized them by dipping : And his Example hath sufficiently shewed us, That in order to the baptizing of many, they usually chose a place where there was good store of Water: Besides that, the Purifications and Bathes of the Ancients, especially of the *Jews* , did much facilitate this Ceremony.

In fine, The Scriptures shew us not any other way of baptizing ; and we can prove by the Acts of Councils and ancient Rituals, That Holy Church, as much as it was possible, baptized no other way.

The very word also which is used in the Rituals, to express the Action of Godfathers and Godmothers, in saying they lift the Child up from the Font , shews clear enough , it was the custom to dip them in it. Tho' these are indisputable Truths, yet neither we, nor the pretended Reformers , take notice of the *Anabaptists*, who hold this dipping as essential, and indispensable, and neither of us scruple to change this dipping of the whole Body, into a meer sprinkling of some part of the Body.

For which no reason can be alledged , but that it is not essential ; and the pretended Reformers agreeing in this, the first Principle we have laid down is indisputable.

S E C T. II.

SECOND PRINCIPLE.

To know what is the Essence of a Sacrament, we must know the essential Effects thereof.

TH E second Principle is, That to distinguish, what is indifferent, or of the substance of a Sacrament, we must look on the essential Effects of that Sacrament.

So, tho the words of Jesus Christ, *baptize*, signifie dip, as hath already been said, yet the general Belief was, the Effect of the Sacrament was not restrained to the quantity of the Water; so that Baptism, by sprinkling or dipping, seeming to have one and the same Effect, is judged valid either way.

But as we have said, there is no essential Effect of the Body in the Holy *Eucharist*, distinct from that of the Blood; so the Grace of both in Substance, and in Effect, are the same.

It is impertinent to alledge here, the Death of our Lord is more lively represented in both *Species*; I grant it: So the new Birth of the Faithful is more exactly expressed by dipping, than by sprinkling. For the Faithful, dipped all over in the Water of Baptism, is as it were buried with Jesus Christ, to use the Apostles expression; and then coming out of the Waters, as out of the Grave with his Saviour, more perfectly represents the Mystery of Jesus, who regenerates him.

Dipping also, which Effects the whole Body, doth also more perfectly signifie, a man is clearly and entirely washed from all his sins. And yet Baptism by dipping, is no more than Baptism by sprinkling: It is enough the Mystery of Jesus Christ, and the Effects of his Grace contained therein, be expressed in general, without that nicety or extreme exactness.

Thus

Thus in the *Eucharist*, the Death of our Lord being sign in Effect, when the Body delivered for us, is given to us, the Grace or Benefits of the Sacrament, by the lively Representation of our spiritual Nourishment under the *Species* of Bread, the Blood, which only more expressly sets it forth, is not absolutely necessary.

This is evident, from the words of our Lord; and the reflexion St. Paul makes, when relating these words, *Do this in remembrance of me*; he concludes immediately after, That as often as we eat this Body, and drink this Cup, we shew forth the Death of our Lord. Thus, from the Disciples Interpretation, the Masters intention is; when he ordaineth, we should remember him, we should commemorate his Death. So that to understand truly, whether this Commemoration consists in the sole participation of the whole Mystery, or in the participation of either Part, 'tis but reflecting; our Saviour does not expect the end of the whole Mystery, or *Eucharist*, before he saith, *Do this in remembrance of me*. St. Paul observed he expressly ordained this Commemoration, at each Part. For when he had said, *But, This is my Body*, *Do this in remembrance of me*; he again repeats in giving the Blood: *As oft as you shall drink this, do it in remembrance of me*. Shewing us, by this Repetition, that in the partaking of each Kind, we set forth his death. Whence it is clear, That when St. Paul concludes from these words, *that in eating the Body, and drinking the Blood, we set forth the Death of our Lord*. We must understand this Death is not only set forth by taking the whole, but also by partaking of either part, and the whole Grace applied to us.

But if any here demand what signifieth the Institution of both Kinds, and this more lively way of setting forth the Death of our Lord? 'Tis from want of reflecting on one quality of the *Eucharist*, so well known to the Ancients, tho now rejected by our *Pretended Reformers*. All the Ancients looked on the *Holy Eucharist* not only as a Nourishment, but as a Sacrifice, and believed it offered to God, when consecrated, before it was given to the People; whence St. Paul, after he had called it *The Table of our Lord*, in his Epistle to the *Corinthians*, 1 Cor. 10. 21. calls it an *Altar* in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*. Hebr. 13. 10. It will be impertinent here to establish, or explain this Sacrifice, since it is al-

1 Cor. 11.
25, 26.

ib. 24, 25.

Exp. Art.
14.

ready done in my Treatise of the Exposition, and since my present Matter requires it, I shall only say, the *Holy Eucharist*, according to Jesus Christ's Institution, consists in the most perfect Representation of the Sacrifice of the Cross; wherefore he expressly said, *This is my Body*, and *This is my Blood*, renewing mystically by the force of these words, as with a Spiritual Sword, with the particular Wounds of his sacred Body, the total Effusion of his Blood, and thò, to make a perfect Man perfectly living, *This Body*, and *This Blood* once separated, must be eternally re-united in his Resurrection; yet in the Mystery of the Holy Table, he resolved to perpetuate the Memory of this Separation once made on the Cross. It is in this Mystical Separation he placed the Essence of the Sacrifice of the *Eucharist* in order to a more lively Representation of the Sacrifice of the Cross: So that as that consisted in the actual Separation of the Body, and Blood, this also, as its most perfect Image, was to consist in this Representative, and Mystical Separation. But whether Jesus Christ separated his Body and his Blood really on the Cross, or mystically on the Altar, yet the Grace and Effects of his Blood are always inseparable from those of his Body: Whence, thò this so lively Image is necessary to the *Eucharist*, yet in Receiving it is not, the Effects of his Blood being as wholly inseparable from those of his Body, as it is easy and natural to represent to the Eyes of the Faithful the actual separation of one from the other. Therefore among the Ancients on so many occasions, we meet with the Body given without the Blood, and the Blood given without the Body, yet never one consecrated without the other. Our Forefathers were fully perswaded, the Faithful would be deprived of something too precious in not consecrating both *Species*, in which, with the Image of his Death, Jesus Christ placed the Essence of the Eucharistical Sacrifice; but in the mean time they thought nothing that was Essential was taken from them, in giving them one only, since in one was contained the virtue of both, and that the Mind once prepossessed with the Death of our Lord in the Consecration of both Kinds, receives nothing from the Altar which reserves not to it self the Figure of Death, and the Character of a Victim: So that whether we eat or drink, or do both together, 'tis always the Application of the

the same Death, and we receive in effect the same Grace.

We must not then so much rely on the eating and drinking, since the eating and drinking spiritually is in effect the same thing, and that both the one and the other is a Matter of Faith. Grant then we eat, or drink according to the Body, as Believers, we both eat and drink together spiritually, and thereby partake of the whole Effect of that Blessed Sacrament.

SECT.

S E C T. III.

The Pretended Reformers agree with us in this Principle, and have no other Foundation for their Discipline.

Mr. Jurieux's Doctrine examin'd in his Book call'd, Le Preservatif, &c.

BUT, not to enlarge Disputes, I would only ask these Gentlemen of the *Pretended Reformed Religion*, Whether, in receiving the Bread of the Lords Supper with a firm Faith, they believe not, they receive the Grace which fully incorporates them to Jesus Christ, and the whole Benefit of his Sacrifice? What serves then the *Species* of Wine for, unless more fully to express this Mystery?

Moreover, They believe they receive not only the Figure, but the proper substance of Jesus Christ, whether by Faith, or otherwise, is not material. Do they receive it whole and entire, or only one half of it in receiving the Bread of the Lords Supper? Is Jesus Christ divided? And if under one Kind they receive the Substance of Jesus Christ whole and entire, how can the Essence of the Sacrament be wanting to them?

And therefore on this account only have they been perswaded to give the Bread alone to those who could not drink Wine. This is expressed clearly in the Seventh Article of the Twelfth Chapter of their Discipline, concerning the Lords Supper.

— This Argument proposed at first by the great Cardinal Richlieu, put our *Pretended Reformers* to a mighty stand. I have in my Exposition endeavoured to solve their Answers as to this Point, and carefully shewn what their *Synods* have determined as to that Article of their Discipline. The matter is clear:
Those

Those who have writ against me, have unanimously confessed it as publick and notorious; but yet agree not in their Answers.

All were not satisfied with their usual Answer, which only consists in saying, Those mentioned in the Article of their Discipline, are excused from taking the Wine, by their aversion to it, or impossibility of drinking it, and that it is a particular Case, which ought not to be drawn into a Consequence; for on the other side, they were very sensible this particular Case was to be decided by some general Principles. If Jesus Christ intended the two *Species* should be inseparable; if the essential or substantial part of the Sacrament consisteth in the mutual Union of both; and whereas Essences are indivisible, these men here receive no Sacrament, but a meer humane Invention, which hath not so much as the least shadow of foundation in the Gospel.

In conclusion therefore they were obliged to say, with much difficulty, and after many turnings and windings, That in this Case he who receives the Bread only, receives not the Sacrament of Jesus Christ.

Mr. *Jurieux*, who was the last that writ against my Exposition, in his Treatise stiled, *Le Preservatif*, after a Perusal of the Answers of others, and much trouble to himself, sometimes in Passion with Mr. *de Condom*, who amuseth himself, saith he, like some petty Missioner, with such inferior Trifles, and with such old kind of Cavils, sometimes relying all he can on this kind of impossibility so often repeated; at last concludes the Party mentioned, who receives only the Bread, to speak properly, receives not with his Mouth, *the Sacrament of Jesus Christ*, since this Sacrament consists of two Parts, and he receives but one: This he also confirms in the last of his Books.

*Preserv.
Art. 13. p.
262. & seq.*

P. 264.

*Ex. de
l'Euch. Tr.
6. Sect. 7.*

This is what the Pretended Reformers had never yet the confidence, as I know of, to assert. In fine, a Communion which is no Sacrament, is a strange kind of Mystery; and the Pretended Reformers, who are at last brought to own it, may as well acknowledge the Consequence we draw from their Discipline, since they find no way to extricate themselves from this Labyrinth of Error, but by a Prodigy unheard of in the Church of God.

BUE

Preserv. p. But our Author's Doctrine seems yet more strange, when
 369. 267. considered in all its Consequences. According to him, the Church presents, or gives in this Case the true Sacrament, yet nevertheless, what is received is not the true Sacrament ; or rather, it is not a true Sacrament in respect of the Sign, but a true Sacrament in respect of the thing signified, since the Faithful receive Jesus Christ signified by the Sacrament, and receive equal Graces with those who communicate or partake of him under the Sacrament, since the Sacrament is delivered to him whole and entire, because he receives it in his Heart, and with his Affections, because that insuperable impossibility alone hinders him from communicating under the Signs.

What good do these Subtilties do him? His Arguments may lead him to this Conclusion, That the Faithful, who cannot, according to his Principles receive the true *Sacrament* of Jesus Christ, since he cannot receive one essential part, through his inability is not obliged to receive at all; and that his desire to receive, answers the Effect. But on this account to separate that which is by its very Institution inseparable, and to give one a *Sacrament* he cannot receive, or rather to give him solemnly that which being not the *Sacrament* of Jesus Christ, cannot be any thing but pure Bread, is to invent a new Mystery in the Christian Religion, and in the face of the whole Church to put a Trick on a good-meaning Christian, who thinks of receiving, what in down-right reality he receiveth not.

Preserv. du Yet, behold here the last and most pitiful Refuge of our
Preserv. *Pretended Reformers*: This is what the last of my Adversaries hath writ against me, whose Book is by the Protestant Parliament put into several Languages with a magnificent Preface in France, Holland, and other Countries, and generally looked on as a sovereign Antidote against this dangerous Exposition which hath been so often assaulted. This Absurdity he hath found out by his improving and refining upon others, That what is so solemnly received amongst them, when they cannot drink Wine, is not the *Sacrament* of our Lord, and consequently a pure humane Invention, which a Church notwithstanding, that pretends to be built on the pure Word of God, hath the Confidence to establish without the least colour from so much as one syllable in that Word.

To

To conclude, Jesus Christ made no particular Law in behalf of those we mention here. No man could dispense with them as to an express Precept of our Lord, nor allow them any thing besides what he instituted. We must either give them nothing then, or if we give them one Kind, we must believe by the Institution of our Lord, the entire Essence of the *Sacrament* is contained under one *Species* alone, and the receiving of the other adds nothing but what is purely Accidental.

Library of the **K** College and **SECT.**

S E C T. IV.

The THIRD PRINCIPLE.

Constant and Perpetual Practice is the best Comment on the Law.

An Exposition of this Principle by an Example of the Civil Law.

BUT to come to this Third Principle, which of it self decides the Question. This is it. *The Practice and Sentiments of Holy Church, is the best Rule to know what is Essential, or not Essential to the Sacraments.*

To speak more generally: In all Matters relating to Practice, the Sense and Practice of Holy Church is the best Guide, and by this we find the true intention of the Law.

I write this to men of Sense, that the constant Practice or Sense in which any Ordinance hath usually been taken, is the best Exposition of it: Otherwise, according to the variety of particular mens Reasons, the Law would become Arbitrary. The most Infallible Rule then in this Point, is exactly to see how it hath been understood, and how practis'd.

God out of honour to his Church, and to oblige particular men to its holy Decisions, was willing this Rule should have the same force in his Law, as it hath in Human Laws; and the true way of understanding this holy Law, is to reflect how it was always understood, and practis'd in the Church.

Because in this constant Sense and perpetual Practice of it, there seemeth to be some Divine and Apostolical Tradition, according to the known Doctrine of the Fathers, That what is Universal as to Time or Place in Holy Church, must needs be derived from the Apostles, who had it from Jesus Christ, and from that Spirit of Truth he left them for their Teacher.

And

And that none may be impos'd on by a different sense of this word, *Tradition*, I declare the Tradition I alledge here as a necessary Interpreter of God's Law, is that Oral, Unwritten Doctrine, which is derived from God himself, and still perpetuated in the constant Judgment and universal Practice of Holy Church.

'Twill be needless here to prove this Tradition; and by what follows, you shall see our *Pretended Reformers* will be constrained to acknowledge it at least in this Point. But 'twill be material here to remove in short those false *Idea's* they usually frame of this Word, *Tradition*.

They tell us, the Authority we give Tradition, subjects the Scripture to the thoughts of men, and declares its imperfection. In this they are palpably mistaken. Scripture and Tradition both together constitute but one and the same Body of Doctrine revealed by God; and Tradition, instead of subjecting the Holy Scriptures to the thoughts of men, doth rather elevate to a higher degree.

When private men are allowed, as amongst our *Pretended Reformers*, to interpret Scripture every one, as his particular Fancy shall lead him, there necessarily follows a liberty of Arbitrary Interpretations; and thus indeed Scripture is in effect subjected to the thoughts of men, who expound it every one as he pleaseth: But when every private man in particular is obliged to receive the Scripture in the sense of Holy Church, and where every one doth, and hath received it thus, nothing can raise the Authority of Holy Writ higher, nor so rescue the Majesty of it altogether from the violation of particular men's Opinions.

The most certain way of truly understanding the true Sense and Meaning of the Law, is to understand it as it hath always been understood, even from its first Infancy or Beginning. This is the best way of honouring the Law-giver, and of advancing the Authority of the Law, or keeping it in its true and genuine Sense, above the reach of particular Lights, or false Glosses of private men.

So when our Forefathers, in all their Councils, Books, and Decrees, obliged themselves to understand the Holy Scriptures in the Sense they were always understood; they were so far from

believing that by this means Scripture would lye obnoxious to Human Fancies, that on the contrary they looked on it as the only Remedy to exclude them.

The Holy Ghost, who dictated the Scripture, and deposited it in the hands of Holy Church, even from the beginning, expounded it to her in all Ages: So that the Sense thereof, which hath always been evident in the Church, is equally inspired with the Scripture it self.

The want of such an Interpretation is no Argument of the Scriptures Imperfection. It becometh the Majesty of Scripture to be concise in words, profound in sense, and full of a wisdom, which the more you search, the less will you be able to fathom. This was the Divine Attribute the Holy Ghost was pleased to give it. It is not to be understood without great Meditation; and what Holy Church, thro' a just Meditation hath understood, is to be rever'd as a Law.

So that what is unwritten, is equally venerable with what is written, since they are both derived to us the same way. They mutually support each other, since Scripture is the necessary Basis of Tradition, and Tradition the only Infallible Interpreter of Scripture. If I should assert, the whole Scripture is to be thus interpreted, I should assert no more than what Holy Church hath always acknowledged. But this would not be material here. I stand to things purely Practical, and especially relating to Ceremony. What I maintain is, we cannot distinguish what's Essential, or Indispensable, from what's Indifferent in the Church, but by the constant Practice and Tradition thereof.

This I undertake to prove by Scripture it self, by all Antiquity, and to compleat my Argument, by the open Confession of our Adversaries themselves. By Ceremonies I understand here the Sacraments, which in effect are sacred Signs and Ceremonies divinely instituted, both to confer and signify Grace.

Experience teacheth us, Ceremony is best explained by its common Practice. This decides our Question. In the sacred Ceremony of our Lord's Supper, we have seen the Church always believed she gave the whole Substance, with the whole virtue of the Sacrament, in giving it only under one Kind.

See

See here the constant Practice, and what ought to pass for a Law.

The *Pretended Reformers* do not reject this Rule. We have seen, that if they looked not on the Judgment of Holy Church, and her Interpretation as a Rule, they would never have divided the Supper, out of respect to those who drink no Wine, nor given a Decision which is not in the Gospel. But 'tis not in this alone they have followed the Interpretation of the Church. We shall see many other Points wherein they recur to this Rule we propose.

Therefore without any more ado, I set down this as a general Proposition, and advance it as a constant Practice, as confessed and acknowledged by the Ancient and Modern *Jews*, by the Christians of all Ages, and by the *Pretended Reformers* themselves, That the Ceremonial Laws are not to be understood but by Practice, it being otherwise impossible to comprehend the true Meaning of the Law.

SECT.

27

S E C T. V:

A Proof from the Observances of the Old Testament.

THE Matter is more surprising in the Old Testament, where we see, every thing was circumstanc'd, and so carefully particularized: Yet nevertheless 'tis certain, a Law written so exactly, required Tradition, and the Sense of the Synagogue to be well understood.

The Law of the Sabbath only, affordeth many Examples in this Point.

- Ex. 16. 23.** Every one knows how rigorously the Sabbath was observed, on which, upon pain of Death, they were forbidden to dress their Meat, or so much as to light their Fire. In short, the Law was so precise in this Case, that many durst scarce move on this holy Day. 'Twas certain, there was no undertaking or continuing a Journey on that day; and 'tis known how it fared with *Antiochus Sidetes's* Army, when out of respect to *John Hyrcanus*, and the *Jews*, he stopped his March for two days, on which they were equally obliged by their Law to rest, as on the Sabbath day. In this rigorous Obligation to rest, Tradition and Custom only can teach us what Grains of Allowance there might be without any profanation of these holy Days. Hence
- Act. 1. 12.** is derived that Expression in the *Acts of the Apostles*, from such a place, to such a place, is a Sabbath-days Journey. This Tradition was established, and never condemned by himself, or his Apostles.

Notwithstanding the rigour of this Sabbath, it was allowed to untie a Beast, or to lead it to drink, or to pull it out if fall'n into a Ditch. Our Blessed Lord, who alledgeth these Examples, as publick and notorious among the *Jews*, instead of condemning them, doth authorize and establish them, tho' the Law had been silent therein, and that they seem obnoxious to the general Prohibition.

Such

Such Observances as these were of great Importance, in a Law so severe, and in which none could prevaricate the least Iota, or Tittle, without incurring terrible Pains, and an inevitable Malediction.

But see what is more important; in the time of the *Macchabees*, 1 Mac. 2. 32, 38, 49. it was proposed whether Self-defence was allowed on the Sabbath day; and the *Jews* suffered themselves to be killed, till the Synagogue declared Self-defence lawful. 41. 2 Mac. 15.

Yet in allowing Self-defence, the Synagogue durst not upon any advantage whatsoever, allow or permit a publick onset. But after the Synagogue had permitted Self-defence, there was *Jos. An.* a scruple yet behind; (*viz.*) Whether it was lawful to repair a Breach upon the Sabbath-day. For tho' Self-defence was decided as lawful, in case of an immediate Assault from their Enemies, yet they doubted whether that Permission might have any force where the Assault was not so immediate. The *Jews*, when besieged in *Jerusalem*, durst not extend this Dispensation so far, and so consequently fell into the hands of *Pompey*. The Scruple seemed too nice; and I produce this Example to instance in what cases the Law had not provided, and where the Declaration of the Synagogue was requisite to appease their Consciences. 24. 2.

The Feast of the *New-Moon* was by the Law indispensably to be kept, and that in order to a more exact Calculation of other particular Feasts. Besides, in those early days there were no regular *Ephemerides*; for the *Jews* never relied on any thing of that Nature, and to avoid the Errors of Calculation, they ordered certain Persons on the highest Mountains to watch the rising Moon. The Law took no notice of this, nor of coming, and declaring this to the Council, nor of publishing the *New-Moon*, or the beginning of the Festival. Tradition, which took care of these things, determin'd also that what was necessary for the observing and declaring of the *New-Moon*, was not contrary to the Law of the Sabbath.

I will say nothing of the Sacrifices, or other Ceremonies, Lev. 24. 8. which, according to the Law, were performed on the Sabbath-Num. 27. day, since the Law having regulated them, we may say there was an Exception in this Point: But many other things were to be done on the Sabbath-day, which the Law had not regulated.

When

When the Passover happened on the first Day of the Week, which is our Sunday, diverse things were to be done for the Preparation of the Paschal Sacrifices. There was the Choice of the Victim, the examining of its Qualifications by the Priests, the bringing it to the Temple and Altar, in order to the Sacrificing it at the Hour appointed.

- All these things, with many other, were perform'd on the Vigil of the Passover. The Leavened Bread was to be cast away, which by the precise Terms of the Law, at the beginning of the Passover day, ought not to be found in all Israel. The Law might have ordered these things on the Friday, when the Passover fell on Sunday; or for the observing of them, might have dispensed with the Sabbath: The Law would not do it: Tradition alone authorized the Priests to do their Functions; and we may say in these Cases, as well as in
- Ex. 12. 15. those our Blessed Saviour hath observed, *the Priests violate the Sabbath in the Temple, and are without Reproach.*
- Matt. 12. 5.

- Doth he not also approve what David did, when contrary to the Law, through Hunger, he eat the Bread of Proposition, or Shew-bread, and in so doing followed the Sense of the High Priest Achimelech, tho' it was no where written?
- Ibid. 4. Lib. Reg. 21. 4. The Passover, with all other Feasts of the Israelites, as well as their Sabbaths, began in the Evening, and according to the express Order of the Law, at the time of Vespers: Yet tho' Vespers, strictly taken, was the setting of the Sun, amongst the Jews the Vesper-time was not so precisely taken. The Law, notwithstanding, did not decide it, and Custom alone had prevail'd, That Vespers, should begin presently after Mid-day, and on the declining of the Sun.
- Levit. 23. 32.

- Ex. 12. 6. The precise Terms of the Law are insufficient to determine what that time was betwixt the two Vespers, which was set apart for the Passover in the Hebrew Text of Exodus, nothing but Tradition alone had shewn, it was all the time comprehended betwixt the declining of the Sun, and its setting.

We must acknowledg all these things were absolutely necessary for the observing of the Law; and if it is clear the Law had no Intention negligently to overlook them, we must conclude it left their Explication to Custom.

We must aver the same thing of divers other Ceremonies; which

which according to the terms of the Law, concurred precisely at the same time, neither was there any possibility of performing them together. As for Example, the Law ordain'd every day an evening Sacrifice, which was call'd the Tamid, or perpetual Sacrifice. There was that of the Sabbath, and that of the Passover, which were to be performed the same Hour; so that on the Passover-day, by express terms of the Law, these three Sacrifices happened together, and yet there was but one Altar for these Sacrifices, and it was neither possible, nor allowed to offer all these Sacrifices at the same time. Nor did they know where to begin; and in so strict and rigorous an Observance, they must necessarily have fallen into great Confusion, had not custom taught them the more ordinary Sacrifice was to be offered first. So they freely offered the perpetual Sacrifice before that of the Sabbath, and that of the Sabbath before that of the Passover.

According to the precise terms of the Law of *Moses*, Deut. 7. 1, Marriage was allowed with any Strangers, except with the 2, 8. Daughters of the seven detested Nations, so frequently detested in holy Scripture. These were the abominable Nations Ibid. 2. which were to be rooted out without any Mercy. It was the Ibid. 4. Daughters of these Nations might seduce the *Israelites*, and entice them to the Worship of false Gods; and therefore the Law allowed not Marriage with them. Nothing of this nature was alledg'd against the Daughters of the *Mochites*, nor of the *Egyptians*, and Marriage was so far from being forbidden with the Daughters of the *Mochites*, that *Boaz*, is commended by the whole Council, and all the People, for his marrying *Ruth*, who was of that Country. See what we meet with in the Law, and yet notwithstanding this, in *Esau's* time, 1 Esd. 9. 2, the *Jews* were obliged to reckon the *Egyptians*, the *Ammonites*, 10, 19. and *Mochites* Daughters, and in fine, all Strangers, in the rank 2 Esd. 13. of *Chamanites*: So that all Marriages contracted with these 12, &c. Women were dissolved as abominable. And whence comes this, if not from the *Israelites* being equally seduced by other Strangers, *Egyptians* and such like, as by the *Chamanites*, as Experience since *Solomon's* time hath shew'd us, and therefore all were justly to be excluded, not by the Letter, and proper Terms of the Law; which they violated in the precedent Practice

Practice relating to the *Moabites*, the Synagogue always perswading herself, she had a Right, even from God himself, to determin such Points according to occurring Necessities, or necessary Occasions.

- I do not believe any one can think that their severe Law of Retaliation, so often mentioned in the Books of *Moses*, was so strictly, in all sorts of Cases, observed according to the Letter. For to go no farther than these Terms only, an Eye for an Eye, a Tooth for a Tooth, Hand for Hand, Bruise for Bruise, or Wound for Wound, nothing can have the Face of a more perfect and just Compensation; yet upon a just weighing of Circumstances, nothing in reality is farther off, and nothing in fine would have been more unequal than such an Equality: Besides 'tis not always possible to give a Malefactor the same Wound, he hath given another. The *Jews* by Practice learn'd, the design of the Law was to make them sensible of a reasonable Compensation, which should be equally profitable to the Publick, and to Men in particular, which not consisting in any precise Point, or certain Measure, was practically determin'd by some equitable Estimation or Value.
- There are many other Traditions, as authentick as these, might be produced: This is allowed by the most able Writers of the Reformation. When therefore they go to destroy all unwritten Traditions in general (from those Words of our blessed Saviour, where he condemns the Traditions which were contrary to the express Terms, or meaning of the Law, and in short, all that were not well grounded) they are very disingenuous: And all sensible Men will agree, there were certain lawful Traditions, tho' unwritten, without which the Law it self was impracticable: So that 'tis clear, they were obligatory even in Conscience, will these Gentlemen of the pretended Reformed Religion, give me leave to produce here, the Tradition of Praying for the Dead? This is clear from the Book of *Macchabees*: Not to dispute here whether this Book is Canonical or not, since 'tis enough for our present Purpose, that it was certainly writ before the Gospel. This pious Custom continues even to this very day among the *Jews*, and the Tradition for it may be established from those Words of *St. Paul*:
- 1 Cor. 15. What shall they do else who are baptized, that is, mortified and purified,*
- Ex. 21. 24.*
Levit. 24.
19. 20.
Deut. 19.
21.
Matt. 15.
3.
Mark. 7.
7, &c.
2 Macc. 12.
45, 46.
1 Cor. 15.

purified, for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Jesus Christ and his Apostles found amongst the *Jews* this Tradition of praying for the dead, without condemning them in the least for it: On the contrary, it immediately descended from the Judaical, to the Christian Church, and Protestant Writers, who in their Books have proved this Tradition Primitive, could never yet trace its Beginning or Origin. And yet 'tis clear in the Law there's no mention of it. The *Jews* received it as they did many other inviolable Traditions.

But if a Law, obnoxious to so many nice Particulars, and as I may say, wholly literal, could not be well understood, or truly interpreted without the Practice, and Declarations of the Synagogue, how shall the Law of the Gospel, think you, where there is a greater Liberty as to its Observances, and where the Practice is less Circumstanced?

This is a Truth, may be confirmed by a hundred Examples, and these I will take from the Practices of the *Preended Reformers* themselves, and at the same time (in order to decide the Questions) you shall see what was the constant Practice of the Primitive Church in this point, since I cannot believe these Gentlemen can with any Candour, or Sincerity reject or disapprove it.

S E C T. VI.

A Proof from the Observances of the new Testament.

THE Institution of the Sabbath, was long before that of the Law of *Moses*, and had its Basis, or Rise from the Creation; and yet these Gentlemen as well as we, freely dispense with that Observance, without any other Foundation than that of Tradition, and the Practice of the Church, which must necessarily proceed from some divine Authority.

To urge here, the first Day of the Week consecrated by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, is taken notice of as a publick Day of Assembly for the Christians, or that in the Resurrection is called the Day of the Lord, is frivolous and impertinent. For as in the New Testament there is nothing of the Sabbath day's being incorporated with our Lords day; so it is clear, the addition of a new Day was not enough to destroy the Solemnity of the old, nor to alter the Precepts of the Decalogue with human Tradition.

Gen. 19. The Prohibition of eating Blood, or of eating the Flesh of strangled Creatures, was given to all the Children of *Noah* before any legal Observances were established, from which the Gospel hath freed us, and this is confirm'd to us by the Apostles in the Council of *Jerusalem*, where it is joyn'd with two immutable Observances; one whereof is the Prohibition of per-taking of Sacrifices to Idols; the other, the Condemnation of Fornication.

Ast. 15. But because Holy Church always believed this Law, tho observ'd for many Ages, not essential to Christianity, the pretended Reformers equally with us dispense with it, tho the Scriptures have no where derogated from so precise and solemn a Decision of the Apostles in that Council, expressly related in the *Acts* by their holy Register.

But to shew how necessary it is to know the Tradition, and Practice of Holy Church, in what relates to the Sacraments, let us consider what is practised in the Sacraments of Baptism, and the Holy Eucharist, both which our Adversaries unanimously acknowledge.

The Apostles, the Heads of the Flock, received from Jesus Christ the charge of Administring Baptism: Yet Holy Church, in cases of Necessity, allowed not only Priests, and Deacons, but even any of the Faithful, to administer the Sacrament.

Matt. 28.

19.

Tertul. de

Bap. Concil.

Illib. c. 38,

&c.

Tradition alone hath made out that Baptism (which by Jesus Christ was left only in the Hands of the Church, and the Apostles) may be validly administred by Hereticks, and out of the Communion of the Church.

In the eleventh Chapter of the Discipline of the Pretended Reformers, and first Article, it's said, *Baptism administred by him who hath no Vocation at all, is altogether void and null*; and the Observations on these Synods declare, *an outwardly seeming Vocation, is enough for the Validity of this Sacrament*, such as that of the Curates, Priests, and Religious in the Roman Church, who are admitted to Preach. Where find we in holy Writ this outwardly seeming Vocation, is sufficient to conferr a Power Jesus Christ hath only given those he himself effectively call'd?

Discip. c.

XI. art. 1.

& observ.

Jesus Christ, said, *Baptize*, that is Dip, as we have often observed. We have also said, he was thus Baptized himself; that the Apostles followed, and that it was continued in the Church till the twelfth and thirteenth Ages; and yet Baptism by sprinkling was admitted without any Difficulty upon the Authority only of Holy Church.

Jesus Christ said, *Teach, and Baptize*; and again, He that believeth, and is Baptized, shall be saved. Holy Church by the Force only of Tradition, and Practice hath declared, the Instruction, and Faith Jesus Christ united to Baptism in these Words, may be separated in relation to little Infants.

Matt. 28.

19.

Mark 16.

15, 16.

These words, *Teach, and Baptize*, confounded our Reformers a long while, and obliged them to say, till the Year 1614. *it was not lawful to baptize without a Sermon immediately before, or after.* This was decided in the Synod of Torming, conformably to precedent Synods. But in the Synod of Castres 1626. they

Discip. c.

XI. art. VI.

Observ. p.

166.

were

were not so straight-lac'd in this point, and resolved, not to press the Observance of the Regulation of *Tonneins*. In fine, it was declared in the Synod of *Charenton* 1631. (in which the *Lutherans* were admitted to the Supper) preaching before, or after Baptism was not an essential Point, but a pure matter of Discipline, which was wholly in the Power of the Church to alter, or to keep. Thus what they had believed and practised so long, as prescribed by Jesus Christ himself, was now changed; and without the least Colour of any Testimony from Scripture, declared a matter of Discipling.

As to little Infants, our Pretended Reformers say well, their Baptism is founded on Scripture; yet they bring no express Passage for it, and all their Arguments are taken from far-fetch'd, doubtful, and even false Consequences.

It is clear, all their Arguments from Scripture on this Occasion are very weak, and those that might have any force here, are wholly enervated by themselves.

1 Tim. 4. That which might import much here, is, That, as on the one side, it is written, *Jesus Christ is the Saviour of all*, and that he himself said, *Suffer little Children to come unto me*: So on the other, he pronounced none without Baptism could come unto him, or have any part with him, according to these Words:

John 3. 3. *If you are not born again of Water, and of the Holy Ghost, you shall not enter into the Kingdom of God.* But according to the Doctrine of our Reformers, these Passages signified very little to it, as an Article of Faith, That Baptism is not necessary to the Salvation of Infants.

Dis. c.XI. Nothing disturbs them more, as to their Discipline, than to see every day those of their Communion so concerned for the Baptizing of their little Children, in case of Sickness or danger of Death. This Piety of Parents is by their Synods stiled an Infirmary. 'Tis a Weakness it seems, to apprehend the Danger of Christian Mens Children dying without Baptism. One Synod condescended to the Baptizing of Children upon an extraordinary Occasion, as evident danger of Death. But the succeeding Synod condemned the Weakness of this; and these strong Brethren blotted out the Clause that respected this Danger; because it seems to favour the necessity of Baptism.

Thus

Thus the Arguments for the necessity of Pædo-Baptism, are confuted by our Reformers. See here those they substitute in their place, as those in their Catechism, in their Confession of Faith, and in their Prayers. That the Children of the Faithful are born in Alliance, according to this promise: *I shall be thy God, and the God of thy Children even to a thousandth Generation.* Whence they conclude, the Virtue and Substance of Baptism belonging to little Children, they should injure them, in denying them the Sign, which is but an inferior thing.

*Cat. Dim.
50.
Confess. du
Foy art. 35.
Forme d'
administ.
le Bapt.*

Such Reasons as these should oblige them to give them the Supper also with Baptism; for those who are in the Alliance are incorporated with Jesus Christ: The little Children of the Faithful are in the Alliance; and therefore incorporated to Jesus Christ; and according to them, having this way the Virtue and Substance of the Supper, we must say here, as in the case of Baptism, it will be injurious to refuse them the Sign.

The Anabaptists hold, these Words, *Let a Man try himself, and so let him eat,* have no more force as to years of Discretion in receiving the Sacrament, than these, *He that believeth, and is baptized shall be saved,* in Baptism.

The Consequence that is drawn amongst our modern Reformers from the Alliance of the ancient People, and from Circumcision concerns them not. The Alliance of the ancient People (say they) was by Birth, for it was Carnal: And therefore the Seal was imprinted on the Flesh by Circumcision immediatly after Birth. But in the new Alliance, it is not enough simply to be born, we must be born again to enter into it: And as there is no Parallel betwixt these two Alliances, there's no making any Conclusion from one Sign that may relate to the other, say they; so the Comparison of Circumcision with Baptism will not hold.

Experience hath shewn, how impotent and improper all our Reformers Arguments from Scripture have been to confute the Anabaptists. So that their last Refuge in this Case is Practice. We see in their Discipline at the end of the eleventh Chapter, the Form of receiving those of riper Years into their Communion, where they oblige the Anabaptist who

is

is converted, to Confess, that the Baptism of little Infants, is founded in Scripture, and in the constant and perpetual Practice of the Church. Where the pretended Reformers believe they have the express word of God on their side, they seldom ground themselves on the perpetual Practice of the Church. But here, where they find no weapon from Scripture to convince the Anabaptists, they are obliged to seek elsewhere, and at the same time to Confess, That in such occasions the perpetual Practice of Holy Church is an Authority sacred, and inviolable.

- Let us come now to the *Holy Eucharist*. The pretended Reformers glory they have in these words, *Drink ye all of this*, an express Command for all the faithful to partake of the Cup. But if we tell them, these words addressed to the Apostles only, then present, were fulfilled, when in effect they all drank of it, as St. Mark saith, what refuge will they find in Scripture ?
- Matt. 26. 27. Where can they find these words of Jesus Christ, *Drink ye all of it*, applicable to any others, than those to whom Jesus Christ said, *Do this* ? These words, *Do this*, relate only to the Ministers of the *Holy Eucharist*, who alone have power to do what Jesus Christ did, (*viz.*) to consecrate, and distribute the *Eucharist*, as well as receive it. How therefore will they prove these words, *Drink ye all of this*, extend any farther ? But if they say, some words of our Blessed Lord relate to all the faithful in general, and some to the Ministers only, what rule have they in Scripture to know what belongs to one, and what to the other, since Jesus Christ speaks every where after the same manner, and without distinction ? But be what it will, say some of them, these words of Jesus Christ, *Do this*, spoken to the Holy Apostles, and in them to the succeeding Pastours of Holy Church, may serve to end this Dispute, since in saying to them, *Do this*, he ordains them to do all he did ; consequently to distribute all he did distribute, and in one word to oblige all succeeding Ages, to what Jesus Christ oblig'd them to. In short, this seems most plausible here ; but when we shew them Jesus Christ did many things in this Mystery, they do not believe themselves obliged to do ; they are still at a loss. For what rule have they to distinguish here ? And since Jesus Christ comprehends all he did under the same word, *Do this*, with-
- out

out any farther Explication, how can we distinguish what is Essential from what is not, but by Tradition? This is unanswerable, and the more you examine Particulars, the more it will appear. Jesus Christ instituted this Blessed Sacrament the Evening, at the beginning of the Night, in which he was to be betrayed. This was the time he chose to leave us his Sacred Body, that was given for us: The Consecrating it at that very hour, might raise a more lively Image of his Passion, and altogether might represent Jesus Christ was to die the last hour, that is in the last Period of times. Yet none believes these words oblige us to an hour so full of Mysteries.

1 Cor. 11.

23.

Luk. 22.

19.

By the Law of Holy Church we are to take that Fasting, which Jesus Christ gave after Supper.

The pretended Reformers will remain altogether uncertain as to the Administration of the *Holy Eucharist*, if they go no farther than bare Scripture, and those words of Jesus Christ they so much insist on. The Anabaptists and other Sects believe each private Christian may of himself Administer this Sacrament in his Family, without the help of any other Minister. Our pretended Reformers will never be able to convince them from Scripture only: They cannot prove against them, these words, *Do this*, were addressed to the Apostles only, if these, *Drink ye all of it*, pronounced in the following part of the same Discourse, without any distinction at all, were directed to all the faithful in general, as they tell us every day. And on the other side, it will be replied, The Apostles to whom Jesus Christ said, *Do this*, assisted then at his Holy Table as simple Communicants, and not as Persons consecrating, distributing, or as Ministers: Whence it will follow these words, give them no Ministry in particular. And in short, nothing but Tradition can convince us, this Sacrament had any peculiar Ministers, especially established by the Son of God; or that these Ministers are those, to whom he gave the Charge of preaching his Holy Word.

This gave occasion to Tertullian, to say in his Book, *de Coronâ Militis*, That 'tis unwritten Tradition only teacheth, the *Eucharist* ought not to be received, but from the hands of Ecclesiastical Superiours, tho' the Commission to give it (if we precisely reflect on the words of Jesus Christ) was directed to all the Faithful.

De cor.

Mil. c. 3.

Et omni-
bus manda-
tum à Do-
mino.

The very same Tradition which placeth the Administration of the Sacrament of the *Holy Eucharist*, in the Pastours of Holy Church only, sheweth us, the second order of these Ministers, that is, to say, the Priests have part in this Honour, tho' Jesus Christ said not, *Do this*, but to the Apostles only, who were the Heads of his whole Flock.

We do not read, our Lord gave his Body, or his Blood to each of his Disciples; but only, that in breaking the Bread he said to them, *Take and eat*: and as to the Cup, it's very probable, that placing it in the midst of them, he ordained them to partake of it one after the other. The Synod of *Privas*, one of the pretended Reformation, mention'd in the ninth Article of the twelfth Chapter of their Discipline, saith, Our Lord permitted the Apostles to distribute the Bread, and the Cup one to the other, and from hand, to hand: But tho' Jesus Christ did it thus, yet constant Practice hath inform'd us, the consecrated Bread, and Wine should be distributed to the Faithful by the Ministers of the Church.

*Disc. c. XII.
art. IX.*

*Syn. de Pri-
vas, ibid.
Syn. de St.
Maixent.
Disc. c. XII.
Observat.
apres P art.
XIV.*

Some of our pretended Reformers in conformity to the Example of our Lord, and the Apostles, would have the Communicants to give the Cup to each other; and certainly, this Ceremony was a solemn sign of Union. But the Synods of our pretended Reformers did not think it necessary in this point, to follow, what by their own Confession was the Practice of Jesus Christ, and his Apostles in the institution of the Supper; on the contrary they allowed the Pastours only the distributing of the Cup, as well as the Bread.

*Conc.
Carth. IV.
c. 36, &c.*

*Disc. c.
XII. Obser-
vat. sur P
art. IX.*

In all Primitive ages, Deacons have been allowed the distribution of the Cup, without the least Authority from Jesus Christ, and his Apostles for any such thing, as by what appears in Scripture: None ever opposed it, and the pretended Reformers approve this Practice in some of their Synods, mention'd in the Observations on the ninth Article of the Chapter concerning the Supper.

They have changed this Practice since, and attribute to all the Pastours only, the distribution of the *Eucharist*, and of the Cup also, even to the exclusion of Deacons, and Elders themselves, tho' amongst them, they in a manner represent the second Order of the Ministers of the Church, that is, that of Priests, who have constantly

stantly not only offered and distributed the Holy Chalice, but also the entire *Eucharist*.

Our pretended Reformers could not come to this Decision at first. Their first Synods allowed the Ministers only the distributing the Cup, *as far as it might be done*. This restriction continued under two and twenty successive national Synods, even to that of *Alais*, 1620. There it was ordained, these words, *As far as it might be done*, should be blotted out, and the Administration of the Cup was reserved to the Ministers alone. The Elders, and even the Deacons till that time, had administered the *Eucharist*, and especially the Cup. The Church of *Geneva* which was formed by *Calvin*, retained this Practice, till 186. *ibid. p. 184.*
 in the Year 1625, they resolved to conform themselves in this Point to the Sentiment of those of *France*. This business met with some contradiction in the Provinces. The reason of the Synod of *Alais*, as you see in the Discipline, is, that it belonged only to Pastours, lawfully establish'd, to distribute this Sacrament: a Maxim which clearly relates to Doctrine, and consequently, by the Principles of the new Reformation, ought to be found expressly in Scripture; whence it follows, all the Synods and other pretended reformed Churches, till that of *Alais*, grossly erred against the Institution of Jesus Christ. *ibid.*
 Or, if they Answer us, These words were not very clear (as these Variations seem to make out) in order to understand these words, they must with us recur to the Interpretation of Holy Church, and that Tradition which subjects us it.

To be together at the same Table, is a sign of Society and Communion, which Jesus Christ was willing should appear in the Institution of his Sacrament, for he was at Table with his Apostles. Some pretended reformed Churches in imitation of this Example, and out of a fond Zeal to do all our Blessed Lord had done, placed the Communicants by Table. *ibid. Obscrv. apres l'art. XIV.*
 The Synod of *St. Maixens*, which is mention'd in the p. 189. same place, rejects this observance.

What was there more apparently opposite to the Institution, than the Custom of carrying away with them the Communion, and of receiving it in private? Yet we have seen, this was Practised in the most Primitive, and Holy Ages, not to insist here on the Practice of following Times.

There's nothing in Scripture hath any seeming Reference to the Reserving (as we ought to do) the *Eucharist* for the use of the Sick ; And yet we find it was practised from the very beginning of Christianity.

Those who mixed both Species, and took them together, seemed as far from the Terms and Design of the Institution, as those who received under one kind only. These two Articles have been approved in the Church, and the Practice of mixing, which our Reformers are most offended with, as we find is most forbidden,

Counc. Br.
IV: T. VI.
Cencil.
Clerom. c.
Ep. 32.

In the seventh Age it is prohibited by the fourth Council of *Brague*, and in the eleventh Age by the Council of *Clermont*, where Pope *Urban* the second, was in Person, with about two hundred Bishops, and by Pope *Paschalis* the second. The Council of *Clermont* excepts the Cases of Necessity, and Precaution. Pope *Paschalis* excepts the Communion of Infants, and of the Sick. This Communion, which was allowed by the *West*, yet with these Exceptions, was in short established there a while; and hath also for six or seven hundred Years last past been the ordinary Communion of the whole *East*, without giving the least Colour, or Occasion of any Schism.

Bas. de Sp.
S. 27.

The most material thing in the Sacraments, is the Words which give Force, and Efficacy to the Action. Jesus Christ hath left no express Words for the *Eucharist* in his Gospel, nor the Apostles in their Epistles. Jesus Christ, in saying, *Do this*, only insinuated they should repeat his own Words, by the Efficacy of which the Bread, and Wine are changed. 'Tis Tradition hath obliged us invincibly to this Sense; and regulated those Prayers which are to be joyned to the Words of Jesus Christ; and therefore St. *Basil* in his Book of the Holy Ghost, reckoneth amongst unwritten Traditions, the words of Invocation, which are used in Consecration, or to render it word for word, when the *Eucharist* is shewn.

By the eighth Article of the twelfth Chapter of the Pretended Reformers Discipline, it is left as an indifferent Matter to the Pastors to make use of the ordinary Words in the Distribution of the Supper. This Article is in the Synod of St. *Fo*, and *Figeac*, in the Years 1578, and 1579. and in fine, you meet with it in the Synod of *Privas*, held in the

Year

Year 1612. *That in the Church of Geneva, the Deacons, nor* *Ibid. Obser.*
even the Ministers themselves, speak not in the Distribution. So *sur. Part.*
 that the Sacrament, according to our Reformers, consisting *IX. p. 185.*
 only in the Usage of it; it is clear they allow a Sacrament
 without Words. In the same Synod of *Primas*, the Deacons *Ibid.*
 who give the Cup are forbidden to speak; because Jesus Christ
 spoke alone; and the Church of *Mets* is exhorted to conform
 in this Point to the Example of Jesus Christ, yet without using
 any Violence.

Therefore according to this Synod, the Example of Jesus
 makes no Law; and other Synods freely allow them to
 separate in Celebrating this Sacrament, the words from it,
 which are in effect the very Soul of the Sacrament, as in the
 Example of Baptism it is evident, not to insist in this place on
 the unanimous Consent of the whole Christian World, and
 that of all Ages.

By these Decisions we see, what Jesus Christ did, in the Eye
 of our Pretended Reformers is no Law. We must always
 distinguish what is essential, and what is not. Jesus Christ
 made no Distinction here, and only spoke in general, *Do this.*
 It belongs therefore to Holy Church to do it, and her con-
 stant Practice should be an inviolable Law.

But to pursue our Adversaries even to their strongest Hold,
 since they put the whole Stress of their Argument in these
 Words, *Do this:* Let us see when Jesus Christ pronounced
 them.

He said them not before he said these Words, *Take, eat, Luke 22.*
This is my Body. For it is then according to St. *Luke* he adds, *19.*
Do this in memory of me; or, *in remembrance of me;* this Evan-
 gelist not mentioning in the least his saying to alter the Cha-
 lice.

It is true St. *Paul* relates, that after the Consecration of the
 Chalice, Jesus Christ said, *Do this in remembrance of me as often* *1 Cor. 11.*
as you shall drink. But in Conclusion, this Discourse of our
 Blessed Saviour, take it in the strictest Sense, imports a condi-
 tional Order only; *to do this in remembrance of Jesus Christ as*
often as one shall do it, and no absolute Order to do it; which
 upon need, or occasion, I could prove by Protestant Interpre-
 ters.

And

And so the words, *Do this*, would absolutely relate to these words only, *Take, eat*, and thus the Protestant Cause would be marred.

But if they say, as some of them do, these words attributed to the reception of the Body, *Do this in remembrance of me*, have equal force with those after the Chalice, *As often as you shall Drink, Do it remembrance of me*, both ordaining only to do it in remembrance, and not absolutely. This will make still worse for them, since thus there will not be found in the whole Gospel, any absolute precept to receive either of the Kinds, much less both.

To Answer, the Institution of Jesus Christ sufficeth them, is frivolous and impertinent, since the Question will still be, what belongs to the Institution of the Sacrament, Jesus Christ not having distinguished it, and all the precedent Examples invincibly demonstrating, 'tis Tradition alone can inform us in this Point.

If they insist in this, that on all Cases the surest way is to do what is written, and what Jesus Christ did: This is with a seeming Reason to evade the Difficulty, since on the one side, there are so many things to be observed without the least Regulation from Scripture; and on the other so many that are written, and done by Jesus Christ, which yet are not observed by them, without the least Colour from Scripture, to assure them they import less than the others.

Basil. de Sp.
S. c. 17.

So that without the help of Tradition we should not know how to Consecrate, how to give, how to receive, nor in one word, how to celebrate the Sacrament of the *Holy Eucharist*, no more than that of Baptism; and by this we may understand with how great reason St. Basil said, That in rejecting unwritten Tradition, the whole Fabrick of the Church and Gospel itself is shaken, and Preaching reduced to meer words, in themselves unintelligible.

In fine, all the Ministers Answers, and particular Reasonings, serve only to bring them into fresh Difficulties and new Mazes of Errours; and the only way to get out of them, is for them with us to seek the Essence of our Lord's Institution, and the right Sense of his Command in the Tradition and Practice of his Church.

If therefore it hath been the constant belief of Holy Church, that the Grace of the *Eucharist* was not restrained to both Kinds; if she hath believed Communion under one or both Kinds equally beneficial to the receiver; if the pretended Reformers have followed this opinion in a certain Case (not mention'd in the Gospel) that is to say, as to those who Drink no Wine, what Difficulty can there be in a thing which is regulated by such certain Principles, or such constant Practice?

S E C T. VII.

*Communion under one Kind establish'd
without Contradiction.*

WE see also Communion under one Kind was establish'd without any noise, Contradiction or Complaint, in the same manner as Baptism was establish'd with bare sprinkling, and many other innocent Customs.

The fear the Faithful had of shedding our Saviour's Blood in a crowd, confusedly approaching to Communion, oblig'd them (being always satisfied with the Sufficiency of one Kind) insensibly to accustom themselves to Communion under one Kind only.

There was so eminent a Danger of spilling this precious Blood, where the Ministers were but few; and where the Churches were full, the Precautions on this occasion, rendred the Service so long, especially on great Festivals, that they there-upon accustomed themselves to Communion in one Kind only.

In the Conference held at *Constantinople*, the Year 1054 under St. *Leo* the Ninth, Pope, betwixt the *Latins* and the *Greeks*, Cardinal *Humbert*, Bishop of *Sylvia Candida*, produced a Custom of the Church of *Jerusalem*, attested by a certain passage

*Disp.
Humb.
Card. apud
Bar. app.
T. XL.*

passage of an ancient Patriarch of this Church: This Custom was to Communicate all the People under the Species of Bread only, and that separately, without mixing it with the other, according to the Practice of the other *Eastern Churches*.

There it is expressly observed, they reserved what remained of the Consecrated Bread of the *Eucharist* for the next day's Communion, without the least intimation of the Chalice; and this Custom in that Church was so ancient, that it was esteem'd Apostolical. But those of *Jerusalem*, I confess, were mistaken in this Point; since according to the Rule of Holy Church, no Customs are to be look'd on as justly Apostolical, but such as are Universal, and in a manner immemorial. Yet thus we see the Antiquity of this Custom. It was received in the Holy City, and in all the Province that depended on it, according to the Cardinal. *Nicetas Pectoratus* his Antagonist, doth not in the least contradict him: The whole World resorted to *Jerusalem* with a particular transport of Devotion to Communicate in those parts, where the Holy Mysteries of our Salvation were accomplish'd. Certainly, the great number of Communicants occasioned the Custom of Communicating under one Kind only: No one condemn'd it; and Cardinal *Humbert*, tho' seemingly concerned at the mixture, saith nothing of Communion under one Kind.

Many reasons encline me to think, the Communion under one Kind, began on great Festivals, because the number of Communicants was then great; and be it how it will, it is certain the People easily Communicated that way, being taught by their ancient Faith, the same substance of the Sacrament, the same effect of Divine Grace, was equally received under one Kind, as under both.

The most certain Sign of the indifferency of any Custom, is, it's being changed without any trouble. So when the giving the Communion to little Infants, or Baptism by dipping were left off, no one was troubled at it: And just so they accustomed themselves to Communion under one Kind; and this way of Communicating continued for many Ages, till the *Bohemians* thought of saying, it was not well. Besides, I do not find, their Patriarch *Wickliff* (with all his rashness) ever condemn'd this Custom of Holy Church: at least 'tis certain, we meet with nothing

thing of it in the Letters of *Gregory* the Eleventh, or in the two Councils held at *London* by *William* of *Courtenay*, and *Thomas Arundel*, Archbishops of *Canterbury*, or in the Council at *Oxford*, celebrated by the same *Thomas*, under *Gregory* the Twelfth, or in the Council at *Rome* under *John* the Thirteenth, or in the third Council of *London* under the same Pope; nor, in fine, in all the Councils, or Decrees, where the Condemnation of this Arch-heretick, with all his Errors, is Recorded: Whence it is clear, he either insisted not at all on this Point, or there was little to do about it.

Calixtus agrees with *Aeneas Sylvius*, an Author about those times, who writ this History, that the first who started this Question, was one *Peter Dresde*, a School-Master of *Prague*, abusing that Passage of *St. John*: *If you eat not the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink not his Blood, you shall have no Life in you.* *Jacobel de Misse*, who towards the end of the fourteenth Age, engaged the whole Church of *Bohemia* in a Schism, omitted this Passage. *John de Hus*, in the beginning of the fifteenth Age, followed him, and the Controversy between us about both Kinds, hath no higher an Original. T. XI. Conc.
T. XII. Conc.
N. 24, 25.

Besides, we must observe *John Hus* presumed not at first, to assert Communion under both Kinds was necessary: It sufficed him they granted, it was allowed, and expedient to give it; but he did not determine the Necessity of it: So certain was it there was no such Necessity. Upon the change of any essential Customs, the Spirit of Tradition, which always resideth in the Church, is always ready to stir up some against it.

The Ministers, notwithstanding all their mighty Arguments, find the People can hardly endure to see their Children die without Baptism, and in spite of that their Opinion, *That Baptism was not necessary to their Salvation*, they cannot divert their dreadful Apprehensions on such an Occasion, nor scarce restrain the Fathers, who are absolutely willing their Children should be Baptized in this Necessity according to the Primitive Custom. I have seen it by Experience, and the same is clear from what I have quoted out of their Synods: So true is it, That there is no resisting a Custom, an Immemorial, and Universal Tradition hath once imprinted on the Minds of

N

Men;

Men; and so far is such a Sentiment, from being obliterated in the whole Church, That it is very hard to extinguish it among those who deliberately contradict it. If therefore the Communion under one Kind hath passed without any Contradiction, or Trouble, it is, as we have said, because all Christians from the Infancy of Christianity were bred up in this Faith; That the same Virtue was contained in either of the Kinds, and in Communion under one Kind nothing of the Substance was wanting.

There was no need of any extraordinary Arguments to convince the Faithful in this Point. The Communion of Infants, The Communion of the Sick, Private Communion, The custom of communicating under one or both Kinds indifferently in the same Church, and in holy Assemblies; and in short, the other things we have seen, naturally grafted this Opinion in the Minds of the Faithful from the most early Ages of the Church.

Conc.

Lamb. C. 1.

T. XII.

Conc.

Thus when *John of Peckham*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, in the thirteenth Age so carefully instructed his People, that in receiving one Kind only, they received Jesus Christ whole, and entire, it passed easily, and without the least Contradiction from any one.

To urge this great Care, shews there was some Opposition, is meer Cavilling, since we have already seen *William* Archbishop of *Chalons*, and *Hugo de Sainte Victore* (not to go any higher at present) had constantly taught above a hundred Years before him, the same Doctrin, without any ones condemning it as new, or strange: So strong is the Impression of it in the Minds of the Faithful: We see how careful the Pastors of God's Church have been in all Ages, and in all Places, by their Instructions, to prevent the least Abuse thro' Ignorance in the People. And in short, it is clear for many Ages, this Article occasioned not the least Complaint, or Contradiction.

I do here also positively assert, None of those who ever held the real Presence, ingenuously questioned Jesus Christ's being entire under each Kind, since to give a Body without Blood and without Soul, would be to give a dead Body, which is dreadful to imagine.

Whence

Whence it follows, That in believing the Reality, one is obliged to believe also the Sufficiency of Communion under one Kind. We see also *Luther* was naturally of this Opinion; and long after his Apostacy from the Church, it is certain he still looked on it as indifferent, or at least of small Importance, *Ep. Luth. highly condemning Carlostadius, who contrary to his Advice had established Communion under both Kinds; and who seemed, Gustol. said he, to place the whole Stress of the Reform, in these things of To. II. Ep. nothing. 56.*

In the Treatise also which he published 1523. on the Formula of the Mass, he hath these insolent Words: *If a Council ordained or permitted both Species, we would in Contempt of that Council receive but one of them, or we would neither take the one nor the other, and curse those who receive either the one, or the other, in virtue of that Ordinance:* Words which manifestly evince, where he, and those of his Sect are so obstinately affected to both Kinds, it is rather from the Spirit of Contradiction than any solid Reason.

In short, he approved the same year the common Places of *Melancthon*, where he placeth amongst indifferent things, Communion under one, or both Kinds. In the year 1528. in his Visitation of *Saxony*, he expressly left them the Liberty of Re- *Visit. Sax. T. VI. lber.* ceiving in one, or both Kinds, and continued still in that Opinion in the year 1533. fifteen years after his Reformation.

The whole *Lutheran* Party suppose nothing that is essential or necessary to Salvation is wanting in Communion under one Kind only, since in the Apologie of the Confession of *Ausbourg* (a Treatise with them as authentick as the Confession it self, and equally subscrib'd to) we have it express, *That the Church is to be excused for receiving but one Kind only, when she could not have both.* *Apol. Aug. Conf.* But the case is quite otherwise in respect of the Authors of this Injustice. What a strange Notion of a Church is this they represent to us before *Luther's* time, as forced to receive but half the Sacrament by the fault of her Pastors! As if the Pastors, by the Institution of Jesus Christ, were not a part of the Church. But in fine, it is clear from hence (by the *Lutheran's* own Confession) That what the Church lost in this case, was not absolutely essential, since it can never be

excusable or tolerable to receive the Sacraments on any account whatsoever, contrary to the Essence of their Institution, and the right Administration of the Sacraments is no less essential to the Church, than the pure preaching of the word of God.

N. 199.

Calixtus, who is very exact in all these Passages, excuseth *Luther*, and the first Beginners of the Reformation, on this account, *That having undertook* (behold here a memorable Confession, and a worthy beginning of the Reformation) *on this account*, saith *Calixtus*, *that the first Reformers having undertaken that blessed Work, rather by the Violence of others, than by any voluntary Motive; that is to say, rather from a Spirit of Contradiction, than any sincere Love of Truth, they could not in the beginning discover the necessity of this Precept of Communion under both Kinds, nor reject that Custom; and yet he seeth not how much he destroyeth the Evidence he attributeth to this Precept, in shewing, the first Reformers where wholly ignorant of it, thô (as they thought) chosen by God himself for that mighty Province. Could not they perceive then, what Calixtus seeth so clear now? Or is not Calixtus himself overseen in asserting that for clear and manifest, which was not perceivable at all by such Doctors?*

Mid. n.
300.

De Comm. sub n. n. 200.
Ujud. n. 76.

But to pass them by, *Calixtus* himself, that very *Calixtus*, who hath been so great a Champion against the Communion under one Kind, at the end of the same Treatise, where he hath opposed it so much, is so far from handling it as a matter of Salvation, that he declares, he doth not exclude from the number of the truly Faithful, our Ancestors who Communicated under one Kind above five hundred Years since, and what is more remarkable, Those who Communicate so at this very day, since they cannot do better; and in general concludes, *That whatsoever we think, or practise in relation to the Sacrament, can neither prejudice our Salvation, nor justify our Separation, since we are not essentially, or absolutely obliged to receive this Sacrament.* Whether this Principle of *Calixtus* be true, and the Consequence from it natural, and just, is not here material. It is enough this eager Champion for both Kinds, is obliged at last to allow, a Man may be saved in that Church, where one Kind only is received: By which he must necessarily acknowledg, That either a Man may

may obtain Salvation out of the true Church, which certainly he will not grant, or which is more, that the true Church may continue so, and yet want a Sacrament ; which is more natural, and what we also say, That Communion under both Kinds is not essential to the Sacrament of the *Holy Eucharist*.

See the Consequence of these mighty Disputes against Communion under one Kind, and after all his Subtlety, and in spite of all his great Efforts to the contrary, he is obliged tacitly to acknowledg, what with all his elaborate Treatises he hath endeavoured to oppose or destroy.

S E C T. VIII.

Mr. Jurieux's History of the taking away of the Cup, Refuted.

MR. *Jurieux* in his last Treatise proposeth to himself the making an Abridgment to the History of taking away the Cup: Where, tho' he would have every thing he layeth down to pass as Infallible, yet we may easily discover, as many Falsities as he hath matters of Fact. *Ex. de l' Euch. 6. Traic. 6. Scil.*

He hath nothing new on the Gospels and Epistles of St. *Paul*, of which we have sufficiently spoken. From the Apostles times he descends to the succeeding Ages, where he plainly and easily sheweth, the use of both Kinds was ordinary: But he soon perceived how frivolous and impertinent this alone would be: For he knows very well, we hold, the same time, Communion in both Kinds was practised, it was not thought so necessary, but that Communion under one Kind was as often, and as publickly used, without the least Complaint of any one, on that Account. To elude the Force of our defensive Arguments in this Point, and to conclude something against us, it was not enough to assure us Communion in both Kinds was frequent, but he ought also to shew us, it was looked on

as indispenfable, and that it was the only Communion in ufe.

Mr. *Jurieux* was fenfible he ought to fay this : And he faid it in effect ; but without the leaft offer to prove it, fo great was his Defpair of fucceeding in it. He thought only by a bold and ftout Affirmative, he might fupply the defect of his Arguments : It is (faith he) a thing notoriously known, and needs no proof ; 'tis unquestionable. Thefe pofitive Kind of Speeches generally impofe on Men : Thofe of the reformed Religion believe a Minifter on his bare word, without dreaming or imagining he fhould have the Confidence to affirm a thing for certainly true, which in reality is not. But by the Unanimous Confent of both Parties. Mr. *Jurieux* lays down here a thing for indifputable, which is not only difputable, but even falfe in the higheft degree.

But let us confider his words, with what follows : This is, faith he, a thing that is not contefted. For a thoufand Years and more no one in the Church, ever undertook to celebrate this Sacrament, and Communicate the Faithful otherwife, than the Lord had Commanded it, that is to fay, under both Kinds ; except when to Communicate the fick more eafily, fome undertook to moiften the Bread in the Wine, and to give them both at the fame time.

The propofition with it's exception are both difingenuous, and void of fincerity.

This is the Propofition, That for the fpace of above a thoufand Years, none ever durft celebrate this Sacrament, unlefs under both Kinds. Firft, he confounds two things, in themfelves very different (viz.) the Celebration of the Sacrament, and the Adminiftration of it. We grant, none ever celebrated it, except under both Kinds ; and we have given a reafon for it, taken from the Nature of a Sacrifice : But that none ever gave it, except under both Kinds, is what we difpute. And good Order not to fay, Sincerity, did not allow, thefe two things fhould be joyned together as equally indifputable.

But what is infulterable, is that they affirm, That for the fpace of above a thoufand Years the Communion was never adminiftered, but under both Kinds, and this as a thing notorious and publick, a thing which needs no proof, a thing as generally agreed on.

Publick

Publick Faith should be more sacred with us, nor should we abuse such weighty Expressions. Mr. *Jurieux* knows in his own Conscience, we deny all he affirms here : The very Titles of the Articles of the first part of this Discourse, sufficiently evince on how many occasions, we maintain Communion under one Kind : God forbid, I should be the first that say it, and I only expound, what hath been asserted by all other Catholics before me.

But is there any thing more disingenuous, than to insist on no other exception as to ordinary Communion, than that of the Communion of the Sick ; and yet in that to find no difference, but the mixing of the Species ? If Mr. *Jurieux* would produce any thing as indisputable among Catholics, he should make use of other Expressions. He knows very well, we hold the Communion of the Sick, consisted not so much in giving them both Kinds mixed together, as in giving them usually the Species of Bread only. He knows well enough, what our Authors say, as to the Communion of *Serapion*; or that of *St. Ambrose*, and many others which I have taken notice of : And in one word, that we assert, the usual way of Communicating the Sick, was to Communicate them under one Kind.

It is already too much, to have the Confidence of denying a thing so well established : But to pursue their Confidence to such a pitch, as to say, it's contrary hath not been questioned, I wonder how Mr. *Jurieux* could be Guilty of it.

But what means he, when he affirms as a thing agreed on by us, *That for the space of above a thousand Years, Communion was always administred under both Kinds, except in the Communion of the sick, where both Kinds were given mixed together.* What an exception is this ! Both Kinds were always given, except when both were mixed together. Mr. *Jurieux* would willingly have said better. But in saying, as he does, *That for the space of above a thousand Years, Communion under both Kinds was always continued,* he perceived he ought at least to except the Communion of the sick. He was willing to do it, but in the mean time, he was sensible such an Exception would ruin so Universal a Proposition ; Besides, it was not likely the Primitive Church should send dying Men to the Tribunal of Jesus Christ, after a Communion so contrary to his Command.

So

So that not daring to assert what naturally came in his way, he fell into a natural confusion.

In short, why doth he mention only the Communion of the Sick? Why doth he here omit the Communion of Infants, and Domestick, or private Communion, both which, as he well knows, we insist on as given under one Kind only.

Why would he evade what our Authors have maintained, or what I have proved after them from the Decrees of St. Leo, or St. Gelasius, that Communion under one or both Kinds, even in the Church it self, and during publick Service, was look'd on and Practis'd as indifferent? Was Mr. *Jurieux* ignorant of these things, not to mention the rest? Could he be ignorant of the Office of Good-Friday, and of Communion in it under one Kind? Could so learned a Man as he be ignorant, what *Amalaricus* with the Authors of the eighth and ninth Ages (whom we have cited) have writ on this Point? To know these things, and yet positively to assert, *That for the space of above a thousand Years, Communion was always given under both Kinds*: Is not this a manifest Prevarication, or a Violation of his own Conscience?

Others of his Communion Act more sincerely: *Calixtus*, Mr. *du Bourdieu*, and others, endeavour to answer these our Objections. Mr. *Jurieux* takes another Method, and pleaseth himself in boldly asserting, *That for the space of above a thousand Years none ever undertook to administer the Communion, except under both Kinds, and that there is no doubt of this*. This is the most compendious, and securest way to deceive the Simple. But we ought to think that all who are willing to be saved will open their Eyes, and not be any longer imposed on.

The only Refuge Mr. *Jurieux* hath is this: To say, That these Communions, so frequent in the Primitive Church under one Kind, were no more the Sacrament of Jesus Christ, than Communion in their Churches given in Bread alone, to those who drink no Wine. I confess, such an Answer as this, would have been something agreeable to his Principles: But after all, I am of Opinion he had not the Confidence to make use of such an Answer, nor to impute to the Primitive Church so monstrous a Practice, wherein a Sacrament is given, which is in reality none, but a meer human Invention in Communion

Notwith-

Notwithstanding in such a History as he promised, he should have always related these important Particulars. He saith not one word of them in his Narrative: I do not wonder at it, for he could not have mentioned so many important Matters, without manifesting to the World the great Dispute betwixt them and Us on this Point, and he was resolv'd to say, it is a thing which wants no Proof, and is not disputed.

I confess in another place, and by way of Answer to these Objections, he hath a word or two of Domestick Communion. But he defends himself with this Answer, *That it is uncertain whether those who carried away with them the Eucharist after this manner, carried not also the Wine, and that this latter is much more likely.* It is certain, this last is much more apparent. Certainly a Man, so positive as he is, very much distrusts his own Cause; but at least, since he doubts, he ought not to say, *That it is a Matter without Dispute, that for above a thousand Years together no one ever undertook to administer the Communion otherwise than under both Kinds.* See! Even in the most early Ages of Holy Church, many Communions, that he himself durst not deny, were under one Kind. *It was an Abuse,* saith he. What then? He should have related the Practice; the Question of the Abuse might have succeeded, and we should then see whether we ought to condemn so many Martyrs, so many Saints, and even the whole Primitive Church which practis'd this Domestick Communion.

Mr. Jurieux breaks off the Discourse too confidently: *Is there,* saith he, *the least grain of Sincerity to draw a Proof from a Practice oppos'd to that of the Apostles, which is condemned as present, and which in the Church of Rome would be looked on as the worst of Crimes?*

Was it not his Design here to insinuate to the World, That, with him and those of his Perswasion, we condemn also the Practice of so many Saints, as contrary to that of the Apostles? But we are far from being guilty of such horrible Rashness. Mr. Jurieux knows it very well; and one who boasts so much of his Sincerity, should have observ'd, That Holy Church (as I have shew'd in another Place) doth not condemn all the Practices she changes, and that the Holy Ghost, who guides her, obligeth her not only to condemn ill Practices, but

also to leave off the use of good ones, and to prohibit them severely, when abused.

I believe the falsity of this History, Mr. *Jurieux* gives us of the first ages for eleven hundred, or a thousand Years is sufficiently manifest: What he hath of the succeeding Ages is equally false.

scil. 5.
p. 469.

I need not mention here how he relates the establishment of the real Presence, and Transubstantiation in the tenth Age: That is not material here; besides we are not obliged to refute whatsoever he advanceth without Proof. But what is remarkable, is, that he looks on Communion under one Kind, not introduced without a supposition of a Transubstantiation. All in good time: When therefore it will henceforth be clear (as we have invincibly shewn) Communion under one kind was practised in the primitive Ages of the Church, and in the holy Times of Martyrdom, it is clear Transubstantiation was then also established; and Mr. *Jurieux* himself must grant this Consequence. But let us return to what follows in his History.

He represents us there Communion under one Kind, as a thing first thought of in the Eleventh Age, when the real Presence, and Transubstantiation were well established: *For then, saith he, they first perceived, That under a Crumb of Bread, as well as under every Drop of Wine, the whole Flesh, and all the Blood of our Lord were included.* What was the Consequence of it? Let us see: This false Reason prevailed in such a manner over the Institution of our Lord, and over the Practice of the whole Primitive Church, That the Custom of Communicating under the sole Species of Bread, was insensibly established in the twelfth and thirteenth Ages. It was insensibly established; so much the more it maketh for us. Then what I have said is true, That the People reduced themselves easily, and without any Contradiction, to the Species of Bread only, so well were they disposed by the Communion of the Sick, by that of Infants, by domestick Communion, and by that which was practised in the Church it self; and lastly, by all those Practices we have seen, to acknowledg, a true, and perfect Communion under one Kind.

This is a difficult Province for our Reformers: They had need to insist so much on these insensible Changes, wherein they

they place the whole stress of their Cause; they never yet, nor ever will be able to produce one Instance of such a Change in essential Matters. 'Tis no Wonder, indifferent Matters should be easily, and insensibly changed: But, as we have said, Matters of Faith, and the essential Practices thereof are not so easily changed. For on such an Occasion, Tradition, the Ancient Faith, Custom it self, and the Holy Ghost (which actuates the mystical Body of the Church) stand in opposition to such a Novelty. When therefore a Change is easily, and without any Difficulty introduced, it is an Argument, this Matter was held indifferent.

Mr. *Jurieu* was sensible of this Consequence; and after his asserting, The Custom of Communicating under the Species of Bread only, was insensibly established in the twelfth and thirteenth Ages, he immediately after subjoins, *It was yet with some Resistance; the People could not part willingly with half of their Sacrament; they murmured every where.* A little before, he said, this Change (not like others, after an insensible manner, without any Opposition or Disturbance) was yet wrought, not without Tumult, or Clashing. These Gentlemen relate things even as they please. The present Difficulty still surpriseth them; and in their own Defence they say not so much what is pertinent, as what is necessary to disengage them for the present. Their Cause requires, and Error can never be otherwise defended. This was Mr. *Jurieu's* Case. This Custom, saith he, that is, the Custom of Communion under one Kind, *was insensibly established; no Noise or Disturbance appears here.* And yet, saith he, *it was not without some Resistance, without Noise, without a general Murmuring; See the Force of Passion.* Truth made him assert the first, and his own Cause obliged him to say the other. In short, we cannot meet with these general Murmurs, these great Reluctances, or Resistances of the People; and this is all, to establish an insensible Change. On the other side, it must not be said a Practice so strange, so unheard of, and so manifestly Sacrilegious, could be easily or peaceably established. To evade this, some Resistance must be supposed, or at least insinuated.

But yet what should be the Subject of these general Murmurings? Mr. *Jurieu* hath gave us his Opinion of them; but

in this he is as impertinent, and incoherent as in all the rest: *What produced these Murmuring, saith he, is, That the People could not patiently suffer themselves to be deprived of one half of Jesus Christ. Hath he forgot what he said even now, That the Real Presence had convinced them, That under each crumb of Bread the whole Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ were contained? Doth he consider what he is going to say, That if the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, and of the Real Presence, be true, it is also true that the Bread contains the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ? Where then was this half of Jesus Christ taken away, which the People suffered (as he saith) with the highest Impatience imaginable? If the People must complain, let their Complaints be for something that may be probable, and bear a Conformity to their Sentiments:*

But truly there was none. Nor doth Mr. *Jurieux* produce us any from the Authors of that Time. The first Contradiction in this Point, is that which occasioned the Decision of the Council of *Constance*, in the Year 1415. It began in *Bohemia* (as we have observed) about the end of the fourteenth Age: If as Mr. *Jurieux* relates, the Custom of Communion under one Kind began in the eleventh Age, and that no Complaints were heard of on this occasion till the fourteenth Age, and that in *Bohemia* only; by this Minister's own Confession, three hundred Years must have passed, before a Change so strange, so bold, and as he would have it, so manifestly contrary to the Institution of Jesus Christ, and all precedent Practices, could have produced any Disturbance. Believe it who will: I am satisfied, no Man with a safe Conscience can believe it.

Mr. *Jurieux* must needs be troubled to see himself, thro' the badness of his Cause, obliged to such pitiful Shifts and Disguises, even in an Historical Account, where all Candour and Sincerity imaginable is required.

Self. 5.
p. 454.

He hath not the Sincerity to state the Question right: The state of the Question, saith he, may be easily guessed at: I hope then, he will declare it clearly, and distinctly. Let us see. It is granted, saith he, when they communicate the Eucharist, as well the People as the Clergy, they are obliged to give them the Bread to eat: But they pretend it is not the same as to the Cup: He will

will not imagine the least, we believe Communion equally effectual under either Kinds. But being willing, thro' the mis-stating of the Question to persuade the World, we believe more Perfection under one, than under the other, or that Jesus Christ is more under one than under the other: He would thus ridicule us. But he very well knows, we are Strangers to such Fancies; and it is clear and evident by this Treatise, we believe Communion given to little Infants for so many Ages under the Species of Wine only, as good and effectual as on many other Occasions, under the Species of Bread only. So Mr. *Jurieux* mis-states the Question: He begins his Discourse of both Kinds with that Question so stated. See here the Man; our Pretended Reformers look on, at this day as the stoutest Champion of their Cause.

S E C T. IX.

A Reflexion on the Doctrin of Concomitancy, and the sixth Chapter of the Gospel of St. John.

IF we add to the Proofs of those Practices from the most primitive and holiest of times, and to those solid Maxims we have established even by the consent of our pretended Reformers; if, I say, we add to all these what we have already said, tho' not sufficiently considered, That the real Presence supposed, each Species must necessarily contain Jesus Christ whole and entire: Communion under one Kind will thus continue established, there being no reason to make the Grace of a Sacrament, wherein Jesus Christ hath vouchsafed to be present, to depend rather on the Species, under which he is present, than on Jesus Christ himself.

These Gentlemen of the pretended Reformation must allow us here more fully to explain this Doctrin of Concomitancy,

so much opposed by them; and since they look on the real Presence as an innocent Doctrine, they ought not for the future to be so averse to a Doctrine which is but the direct Consequence of it.

Exam.
p. 480.

Mr. Jurieux hath confessed in the Places before cited. *If, saith he, the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the real Presence were true, it is true the Bread would contain the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ.* So that you see, Concomitancy is an Effect of the real Presence, and our pretended Reformers allow this Consequence themselves.

Let them suppose then a little, this real Presence, since they wink at it in the *Lutherans*, their Brethren, and let them with us consider its necessary Consequences: They will perceive our blessed Lord, could not give us his Body and his Blood perpetually separated, nor give us either of them, without giving us his entire Person at the same time under either.

Heb. 11.
14, 17.

Certainly when he said, *Take, eat, This is my Body*, and by those words gave us the Flesh of his Sacrifice to eat, he very well knew he gave us not, the Flesh of a pure Man, but a Flesh united to the Divinity, and in a word, the Flesh of God and Man both together. The same must we say of his Blood, which would not be the Price of our Salvation, if it were not the Blood of God; Blood which the Divine Word had in a particular manner appropriated to himself, by becoming Man, according to those words of St. Paul: *Because his Servants are composed of Flesh and Blood; he who ought in all things to be like unto them, would partake both of the one and the other.*

But if in his Sacrament he would not give us a Flesh purely human, much less would he give us in it a Flesh without a Soul, a dead Flesh, a Carcass, or which is the same thing, his Flesh separately from his Blood, or his Blood actually separated from his Body, for this would be to dy often, or often to shed his Blood, which is below the Majesty of his glorious Resurrection, by virtue of which he ought eternally to keep human Nature as perfectly entire, as when at first he assumed it. So that he well knew, in his Flesh we should have his Blood, and in his Blood his Flesh, and in either his blessed Soul united with his Divinity whole, and entire, without which his Flesh would not be quickening, nor his Blood full of Spirit, and Grace.

Why

Why then in giving us so mighty Treasures, his holy Soul, his Divinity, his whole self, did he only express his Body and his Blood, unless to teach us this Lesson, That by that Infirmity he vouchsafed to have Communion with us, we must reap the Benefit of his Power and Strength? And why in his word hath he separated this Body, and this Blood, which he would not effectually, unless for that little time he was in the Sepulchre, if not to teach us also, this Body and this Blood, with which he nourisheth, and quickeneth us, would not prove so effectual without being once actually separated; or if the violent Death of our Blessed Saviour, by which he became a Victim for us, had not been the Consequence of this Separation? So that the Vertue of this Body, and this Blood, being derived from his Death, he was for preserving the Image of this Death in the Holy Supper, and by so lively a Representation, steadfastly and constantly fix our Minds on the Cause of our Salvation, that is the Holy Sacrifice of the Cross.

By this Doctrine we are to have our living Victim, under an Image of Death; otherwise we should not be enlivened. Jesus Christ tells us also at his Holy Table: *I am living, but I have been dead; and living in effect, I yet bear about me the Image of that Death I have endured.* Thus I enliven others, because by the figure of my Death once suffered, I bring Believers to that Life which I possess eternally. Apoc. 1. 12.

Thus the Lamb of God, who is before the Throne as dead, or rather, as slain, does not cease to be living, for he is so in effect, and sends throughout the World, the seven Spirits of God, and he takes the Book and opens it, filling Heaven and Earth with joy, and with Grace. Apoc. 5 6.

Our Reformers will not, or perhaps cannot understand so high a Mystery, for it enters into no Hearts, but such as are disposed and prepared for it by a purified Faith: But if they cannot understand it, they may at least understand, we cannot believe a real Presence of the Body, and Blood of Jesus Christ, without all the other things we have even now explained; and this is what we call Concomitancy.

Supposing then Concomitancy, and Jesus Christ whole, and entire under each Kind, it is easie to understand, in what the Virtue of this Sacrament consists. The Flesh profiteth nothing,

John VI. nothing, and if we understand it as *St. Cyrill*, whose Sense the whole Council of *Ephesus* followed, it profiteth nothing to believe it alone, to believe it the Flesh of a pure Man only : But to believe it the Flesh of God, a Flesh full of Divinity, and by consequence of Spirit and of Life, it certainly profiteth very much, since it is thus impregnated with an infinite power, and with it we receive not only the entire humanity of Jesus Christ, but his whole Divinity also, the very Source, and Fountain of Grace.

Therefore the Son of God, who understood what he would place in his Mystery, understood also very well how to inform us, in what he would place the Virtue of it. What therefore he hath said in *St. John* should be no more objected :

Joh. 6. *If you Eat not the Flesh of the Son of Man, and Drink not his Blood, you shall not have Life in you.* The natural, and most obvious Sense of these words is, there is no Life for those who separate themselves from one and the other : For truly, it is not eating and drinking, but the receiving of Jesus Christ that giveth Life. Jesus Christ himself saith, and it is excellently well observed by the Council of *Trent*, too unjustly calumniated by our Adversaries : He who hath said, *If you Eat not the Flesh of the Son of Man, and Drink not his Blood, you shall not have Life in you*, hath also said, *If any one Eat of this, he shall have Life everlasting.* And he who said, *who Eats my Flesh, and Drinks my Blood, hath eternal Life*, hath also said, *The Bread which I will give is my Flesh, which I will give for the Life of the World* : And lastly, he who said, *He that Eats my Flesh, and Drinks my Blood, remains in me, and I in him*, hath also said, *he who Eats this Bread shall have eternal Life* ; and again, and again, *He that Eats me lives for me, and shall live by me.* By which he obligeth us not to the Eating, and Drinking at his Table, or precise to the Species of his Body and Blood, but to his proper Substance which he there giveth us with Life and Grace. So this passage of *St. John* which occasioned *Jacobel* with all *Bohemia* to Apostatize, becomes a proof for us. We need no others than our pretended Reformers, to defend us, if we please, against this passage so much insisted on by *Jacobel*, since they generally Confess this passage relates not to the *Holy Eucharist*. *Calvin* hath said it, *Aubertin* hath said it, every one saith it, and Mr.

Mr. du Bourdieu hath the same also in his Treatise, we have so often quoted. But not to insist on these Confessions, we hold according to all Antiquity, a passage where the Flesh, and Blood as well as Eating and Drinking are so often, and so clearly distinguished, can not be understood merely of a Communion where Eating, and Drinking amount to the same thing, I mean, a spiritual Communion, and by Faith. Let them Guard themselves against the Authority of this passage, where the design being to explain the Virtue and Benefits of the *Holy Eucharist*, it is clear our Blessed Saviour placed them not in Eating and Drinking, nor in the manner of receiving his Body and his Blood, but in the Substance both of the one and the other. Whence the Primitive Fathers as St. Cyprian, he who most certainly Administred nothing, but the Blood only to little Infants, as we have it precisely in his Treatise *De Lapsis*, saith the Parents, who led their Children to the Sacrifices of Idols, depriv'd them of the Body and Blood of our Saviour: And in another place he teaches, that whatsoever is intended by these words (*If you Eat not my Flesh, and Drink not my Blood, you shall not have Life in you*) is actually fulfilled in those, who have Life (and consequently in Infants) by giving them the Blood only. St. *Augustin* saith often the same thing, tho' in one of his Epistles he had seen, and examined that passage of St. Cyprian, where he speaks of the Communion of Infants by Blood alone, without taking notice of any thing as extraordinary in this way of Communion; and that the *African Church*, where St. *Austin* was Bishop, without doubt retained the Tradition, St. Cyprian (so great a Martyr) Bishop of *Carthage*, and Primate of *Africa*, had left behind him. The substance of this is, that the Body, and Blood inseparably accompany each other, tho' the Species, by Virtue of the Institution, are taken separately, their Substance is as inseparable as their Virtue or their Grace: So that Infants in drinking only the Blood, receive also the whole and entire Substance of this Blessed Sacrament, and in effect, an actual and perfect Communion.

All these things sufficiently shew, why we believe Communion in one Kind, or both, equally contains the Substance or Essential Effects of this Sacrament. The Practice of all Ages, which hath thus explained it, is grounded on the Foundation of the

Calvi.
Inst. IV.
Amb. lib. 1.
de Sacr.
Euch. c.
30. Sc.
Reph. c. VI.
p. 201.

Test. ad
Quir. III.
25, 26.

Mystery, and in the very words themselves of Jesus Christ; and never was any Custom built on a more solid Foundation, or a more constant Practice.

S E C T. X.

Some Objections answered by the precedent Doctrin.

I am not at all surprized, our Pretended Reformers, who acknowledge or admit nothing but bare signs in the Bread and Wine of their Supper, should be so earnest for both: But I wonder they will not understand, that we placing, as we do, Jesus Christ under either Kind, can rest satisfied with one.

*Exam. Tr.
VI. Sect.
VI. p. 480.
481.*

Mr. *Furieux* objects against us, that the real Presence supposed, the Body and the Blood would really be received under the Bread alone, but yet that this would not be enough, because this would be to receive the Blood, but not the Sacrament of the Blood: This would be to receive Jesus Christ wholly, entirely, really, but not Sacramentally as they call it. Is it possible, a Man should believe it not enough for a Christian to receive Jesus Christ entire, in a Sacrament where Jesus Christ vouchsafeth to be present with all his Graces? is not this to place the Virtue of this Sacrament, rather in the Signs under which he is veil'd, than in his own Person whole and entire, contrary to his own words, *He who Eats of this Bread shall have eternal Life*, and, *He who Eats me shall live for me, and by me, as I my self live for my Father and by my Father?*

*John 6. 57.
58.*

*Sup. 2. p.
Art. 11.*

But if Mr. *Furieux* urgeth in despite of these words, that 'tis not enough to have Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, without the Image of his Death; in this, as he only repeats an objection already cleared, so I refer him to my former Answers on this point, and to the unquestionable Examples I produced in order to shew, that by the clear and open Confession of those of his Church, when the Substance of the Sacrament is received, the

the ultimate perfection of it's Signification is no more necessary. But if in those very Sacraments, wherein Jesus Christ is not really and substantially contained, as in that of Baptism, this Principle doth yet hold : how much more doth it hold in the *Holy Eucharist*, where Jesus Christ is personally present, and what can he desire more who possesseth him whole and entire ?

But some will say, in short, we are not to reason so much one express words. Since its your opinion the sixth Chapter of *St. John* is to be understood of the *Holy Eucharist*, there's no dispensing with the Practice as to the Letter, since you are obliged to give the Blood to Drink, as well as the Body to Eat, Jesus Christ having equally pronounced both, *If you Eat not my Body and Drink not my Blood, you shall have no Life in you.*

Let us once silence these obstinate and contentious Spirits, who will not understand these words of Jesus Christ by their whole Tenour and Connexion. I ask them, why according to these words, they believe not Communion absolutely necessary for the Salvation of all Men, yea even of little Infants newly Baptiz'd. If there must be no Explication, let us give the Communion to others, and if there must be, let it be by the same Rule. I say by the same Rule, because the same Rule, or Principle by which we learn Communion in general, is not necessary to the Salvation of those who have receiv'd Baptism ; we learn also the particular Communion of the Blood, is not necessary to those who have already partaken of his Body.

The Principle which informs us, Communion is not necessary to the Salvation of little Infants baptiz'd, is, that they have already received the remission of Sins, and a new Life in Baptism, as being thereby regenerated and sanctified : So that if they should perish for want of being Communicated, they would perish in the State of Innocence and Grace. The same Principle sheweth also, he who hath received the Bread of Life, hath no need of receiving the sacred Blood, since as we have often demonstrated, he hath received with the Bread of Life, the whole Substance of the Sacrament, and with that Substance, the whole Essential Virtue of the *Holy Eucharist*.

The Substance of the *Eucharist* is Jesus Christ himself : The Virtue of the *Eucharist* is to nourish the Soul, to preserve therein that new Life it received in Baptism, to strengthen its

Union with Jesus Christ, and even to sanctifie and enliven our very Bodies: I ask, whether in the very Moment the sacred Body of our Lord is received, all these Effects are not also received, and whether the receiving of the Blood can add any thing thereunto that is essential.

This is what relates to the Principal, let us come now to what relates to the Authority.

The Authority which convinceth us, Communion is not so necessary to the Salvation of little Infants, as Baptism, is the Authority of the Church. An Authority which in effect carries with it in the Tradition of all Ages the true Sense of Holy Writ; and as this Authority hath taught us that he who is baptized, wants not any thing necessary to Salvation; so doth it also teach us that he who receives one Kind, receives also the whole effects of the *Eucharist*: Whence in the most primitive Times they communicated indifferently either under one, or under both Kinds, without the least thought of Hazard that Grace they were to receive in the Sacrament.

Jo. 6. 54. Wherefore, tho' it be written, *If you do not eat my Body, and drink my Blood, you shall have no Life in you*: It is also writ to Jo. 3. 5. the same purpose, or after the same manner; *If a Man be not regenerated of Water and of the Holy Ghost, he shall not enter into the Kingdom of God*: Holy Church never understood an equal necessity in these two Sentences: On the contrary, she always looked on Baptism, which giveth Life, as more necessary than the *Eucharist* which preserves it. But as Nourishment always follows Birth, if the Church was not sensible of being taught by God, it would not have refused to Christians regenerated by Baptism, that Nourishment Jesus Christ prepared for them in the *Eucharist*. For neither Jesus Christ nor the Apostles left any thing in Writing concerning it. Holy Church then hath learnt by another way, but always equally certain, what she can continue or dispense with without any prejudice to her Children, and all they have is stedfastly to rely on her Faith.

Let not our Adversaries dream they can evade the force of this Argument, under a pretence of not understanding these two Passages of the Gospel as we do. I know very well they neither understand this Passage, of Baptism with Water, where it is said, *If you be not regenerated or born again of Water,*
and

and the Holy Spirit; nor this other, of the eating and drinking of the *Eucharist*, where it is writ, *If you eat not, and drink not*: Thus they are not sensible of their equal Obligation from these Passages to give the *Eucharist*, as well as Baptism to little Infants. But not to insist too much on these Passages, let us make them only this Demand. This Precept, *Eat you this, and drink you all of this*, which as you think, is so universal, doth it include little Children that are Baptized? If it comprehends all Christians, by what Text of Scripture are little Children excluded? Are they not Christians? Shall we joyn with the *Anabaptists*, and say they are not, in spite of all Antiquity which hath looked on them as such. But why without some Authority from Scripture will you exclude them from so general a Precept? In a word, on what ground hath your Discipline proceeded in making this precise Law, *Children under twelve Years old, shall not be admitted to the Supper*: But for those *Disc. c. 22. Art. 2.* above that Age, it shall be left to the Discretion of the Ministers. Your Children, are they not Christians before that Age? Do you refuse them till that Age, because St. Paul *1 Cor. 11. 28.* hath said: *Let a Man prove himself, and so let him eat.* But we have also seen it is as precisely written, *Teach, and Baptize; he that shall believe, and be baptized; do Penance and receive Matt. 28. Mar. 16. Act. 2. 38.* Baptism: And if your Catechism expound it ought to be only in respect of such as are capable, why may we not say as much of what the Apostle Recommends? The Apostle in no wise, decides which is the proper Age for this Probation. Children are at the Age of Reason before twelve Years old, they are capable of being either Vertuous, or Vicious: Why do you dispense with your Children in a divine Precept whereof they are capable? If you answer, Jesus Christ left that to his Church, shew me some Scripture for it; or believe with us, that all that is necessary to the true Understanding and Practice of the Gospel is not written; and so by Consequence we must rely on the Authority of Holy Church.

S E C T. XI.

A Reflexion on the manner how the Pretended Reformers make use of Scripture.

Basil de Sp.
S. c. 27.

ST. Basil adviseth us, That those who despise unwritten Traditions, do at the same time despise the Scriptures themselves, which they boast of as their Rule in all things. This is these Gentlemens Misfortune: They talk to us of nothing but Scripture, and Glory in establishing all the Practice of their Church by this Rule. And yet they very easily dispense with many important Practices expressly mentioned in Scripture.

They have taken away Extreame unction so expressly ordained in the Epistle of St. James, tho the Apostle annexed to it so clear, and plain a Promise of the remission of Sins.

They neglect the imposition of hands which the Holy Apostles used towards all the Faithful in giving the Holy Ghost, and as if this Divine Spirit was not to descend any otherwise than visibly, they despise the Ceremony by which he was given, because he is now no more given after this visible manner.

Disc. ch. 1.
art. 8.
& Observ.

The imposition of hands in the ordaining of Ministers is with them equally despised. For tho they usually Practise it, they give out in their Discipline, they look on it as not Essential, and that a Practice so clearly set down in Scripture, is yet dispensable. No less than two National Synods have declared there was no necessity of making use of it; and yet one of these Synods adds, they ought to make it their business to conform to each other in this Ceremony, because it is expedient for Edification, agreeable to the Custom of the Apostles themselves, and the Practice of the primitive Church. Thus the Custom of the Apostles, tho often and manifestly expressed in Scripture, is no more a Law to them, than the Practice of the primitive Church, to think ones self obliged to this

Pois. 1560.
Par. 1565.

this

this Custom is censur'd as a Superstition by their Discipline, *Ch. 1.*
such false Ideas of Religion, and Christian liberty do they en- *Art. 8.*
ertain themselves with.

But what need we instance in particulars here, the whole *Conf. de*
State of their Church is manifestly contrary to the word of God. *Foy art. 31.*
I call, with them, the State of the Church, the Society of Pa-
stors, and people established: This is what in their Confession
of Faith they call the State of the Church, declaring therein,
this State is founded on the extraordinary Vocation of their first
Reformers. In Virtue of this particular Article of their Con-
fession of Faith, one of their National Synods hath determin'd,
That when a Question shall be rais'd concerning the Vocation
of their Pastors, who have reformed the Church, or of the
Authority they had to reform, and to teach it must be refer-
red, according to the Thirty first Article of their Confession of *Synd. de*
Faith, to an extraordinary Vocation, by which God interiously *Gap. 1603.*
pushed them on to their Ministry: Yet they produce no Mi-
racles to confirm this, neither do they prove (which is more *Sur. p*
material) by any Text of Scripture, that such a Vocation *Conf. de*
should ever have place in the Church: From whence we con- *Foy. art. 4.*
clude their Pastors have no Authority to Preach, according to
those words of St. Paul; *How shall they Preach unless they be sent;*
and that the whole State of their Church is without Foundation. *R. 10. 15.*

They flatter themselves with these vain thoughts, that Jesus
Christ hath left a power in the Church, to take what form it
pleaseth, and to establish Pastors when the Succession is inter-
rupted; this is what *Mr. Jurieux*, and *Mr. Claude* endeavour
to prove without the least Colour from Scripture, since on the
contrary Jesus Christ hath said, *My Father sent me, so send I you;* *Joh. 20.*
and St. Paul an Apostle by Jesus Christ, established *Titus* so as *21.*
he might afterwards establish others: Thus the Mission was *Gal. 1. 1,*
wholly deriv'd from Jesus Christ, who was sent from God. *Tit. 1. 5.*
See what we find in Holy Writ; and this they would say at
present of the Authority of the People is but a meer illusion,
and a bare Artifice.

The same Errour occasions the Ministers to say, the Church
hath the Liberty to frame what Government soever she shall
think convenient; to abolish, or retain Episcopacy, to make
Ancients, and Deacons for a time, that is to send them back
again

again to a secular Life, after having consecrated them to the Service of God, to give them equal power with the Pastours to decide Points of Doctrin, that is to say, to admit them without being Pastours to the most Essential part of the Pastoral Function : All which we find in their Discipline, and in their Synods without the least shadow from any Text of Scripture to second their pretensions to this power of disposing all things according to their own Fancy.

In these, and many other matters, I could instance, they have not only no Scripture on their sides, as they are obliged to have : But besides, they become their own Popes, dispensing with themselves as to the following of it, without either the least Reason or Tradition to support them. On the contrary, Tradition hath always received both Extream Unction, and the Imposition of hands (as well that which is used in the Consecration of Ecclesiastical Ministers, or in their Ordination) and also those other things our Reformers have rejected. In this point their Licence is extravagant : But they should in reality be more just to us, since in the Administration of the Sacraments we follow constant Tradition, and the Universal Practice of Holy Church, as the most Genuine and proper Interpreter of Scripture.

S E C T. XII:

Some incident Difficulties : frivolous and idle Subtilties of the Calvinists, and particularly of Mr. Jurieux : The judgment of Antiquity concerning Concomitancy ; Veneration and Respect exhibited to Jesus Christ in the Eucharist : The Doctrine of this Treatise confirmed.

VWE should here have ended this Discourse, had not a charitable concern for the Salvation of these Gentlemen, oblig'd us to remove some Scruples, which the perusal

sal of these Practices I have related, may perhaps have raised in their minds.

It is constantly insinuated by the Ministers, that Concomitancy, on which we conclude the validity of Communion under one Kind, is a Mystery unknown or unheard of in the primitive Church, wherein it was never mentioned as a matter of Faith, that together with his Body, his Blood, his Divinity were also certainly received. They say also, this Doctrine of Concomitancy, being according to us a necessary consequence of the real Presence, it may be believed, that one cannot be known, or heard of without the other.

The Ministers object to us those very Precautions, we have our selves insisted on. We do not find, say they, in the primitive Church any of these Precautions, established in these later Ages, for keeping the *Eucharist*, for stirring up the People to adore it, or to prevent its falling on the Ground. Notwithstanding this dread or fear, Communion in both Kinds, was administered to all the People for many Ages ; and these new Precautions serve for nothing, but to shew us they have a different opinion of the *Eucharist*, from that of the primitive Times.

For a Conclusion they tell us, we have given our selves a needless trouble, in taking so much pains to prove, it is an indifferent thing to Communicate under one or both Kinds, since the main result from this Proof is, that the People must be left to their choice in this Point, and that we must not restrain a Liberty Jesus Christ himself hath left them.

But to begin with what seems most plausible, Who knows not that in things in their own Nature indifferent, Holy Church may choose either part, and that by this choice the thing ceaseth to be any longer indifferent, and becometh altogether Obligatory ? St. *Augustin* hath very often declared it an intolerable folly, to reject what hath been regulated by a general Council, or by the universal Custom of the Church. But if our Reformers are not disposed to believe St. *Augustin* in this point ; will they allow any of their Communion under pretence of Baptisms, being administered a long time by dipping, should with the *Anabaptists* question the validity of his Baptism, or obstinately require himself to be re-baptized,

*Epist. ad
Fan. lib. de
Bapt. Sc.*

Q

or

or his Children to be baptized according to the ancient Practice? Or if he should demand the *Eucharist* for his Son, tho' yet an Infant, under pretence that it was administred to little Children for a thousand Years, would they think themselves obliged to condescend to his Desire? On the other side, would they not look on such a one as a turbulent, and troublesome Member? Would not they answer with the Apostle, If any one amongst you be contentious, we and the Church of God have not this Custom; and had they never so little ingenuity, would they not find in this passage alone enough to oblige them to submit to the Authority of Holy Church in this point? Moreover it is certain the primitive Church, tho' she baptized little Infants which were brought to her, did not yet always rigorously oblige the Parents to present them at that Age, on condition they baptized them in times of Danger; and the Church History affords us an instance of many *Catechumens* of riper Years, which yet the Church oblig'd not to sooner Baptism. The pretended Reformers, who believe not the necessity of Baptism, and cannot find any Divine Precept for Administring Baptism to Infants, are much more free or indifferent in this Point. This liberty they take, hath it violated the severity of their Discipline, which obligeth Parents under pain of the most rigorous Censures, to bring their little Children to be baptized? Let them then allow with us the Church can make Laws in indifferent matters; and if they acknowledg by so many Examples, that Communion under one or both Kinds is of this Nature, let them not cavil any longer with us about this Point to no purpose.

1 Cor. 11.
16.
*Disc. c. XI.
du Bapt.
art. XVI.
& Observ.*

But perhaps they would say, in these Practices I have instanc'd, those who Communicated sometime under one Kind, Communicated also sometimes under the other; which in all Respects is enough to accomplish the Precept of our Lord: As if our Lord would at the same time inspire us with a firm Faith, that we lose nothing by taking one Kind only, and yet oblige us under pain of Damnation to both; so manifest a Cavil that it merits not a refuting.

We must therefore once more examin what is essential to the *Eucharist*, and find out a Rule to understand it aright. This is what these Gentlemen will never do without our Principles,

ciples, and the Authority of Tradition. Mr. *Jurieu* goes too far, when he proposeth for a Rule according to the Principles of his Religion to do universally all that Jesus Christ did, so that we should look on all Circumstances, he observed as of absolute necessity. These are his words. To this purpose he instances the ancient Passover of the Jews, where after the cutting the Throat of a Lamb in the Morning, another was to be cut in the Evening, roasted, and Eaten with Bitter Herbs, to be consumed the same Night, and nothing of it to be kept till the following day. He represents the necessity of all these Ceremonies, and not only the Substance, but even all the Circumstances. This word of Jesus Christ, *Do this*, makes him conclude the same of the *Eucharist*. So that according to his Principles, we should be obliged to all Jesus did; and not only to Bread and Wine, but even to the hour, and the whole manner of receiving it; and the rather, because as we have seen, every thing therein was as rational and mysterious as any thing *Moses* ordained concerning the ancient Passover. Yet how many things have we observed, these Ministers with us equally omit? But behold one I have not yet observed, which here may be very material.

Amongst other things our Lord observed in the last Supper, one of those the *Calvinists* believe, as most necessary, is the breaking of the Bread. The *Lutherans* are of a contrary Perswasion, and make use of round Breads which they break not. This is a great Dispute betwixt these Gentlemen. The *Calvinists* build much on this, That the Evangelists and St. Paul unanimously agree, the same Night Jesus Christ was delivered to the Jews he took Bread, brake it, and gave it. They insist much on this breaking of the Bread, which according to them represents that the Body of our Lord was broken for us on the Cross, and take great Notice that St. Paul, after having said, that Jesus brake Bread, makes him say according to the Greek Text, *This is my Body broken for you*; to shew, as they pretend, the Reference this Bread broken hath to the Body immolated. So that they look on this breaking as necessary to the Mystery; and this makes those of *Heidelberg* say in their Catechism, so much cried up by their Party, *That as truly as they see the Bread of the Supper broken to be given to them, so truly hath Jesus been offered, and broken for us.*

Ex. i. v. 1.
Sabb. 5.
p. 455.

1b. 5. 6.
474, 475.

Sup. 2. p.
art. VI.
p. 296.

1b. 1.

I Cor. II.
24.

*Colloq.
Cathol. an.
1661.*

An Union with the *Lutherans* was proposed, and a Conference held in order to it 1661. The *Calvinists* of *Marpourg* on this Occasion quickly found out a Distinction, and in the Declaration they gave the *Lutherans* of *Rintell*, they asserted the breaking belonged not to the Essence, but only to the Integrity of the Sacrament, as being necessary because of the Example, and Command of *Jesus Christ*: So that the *Lutherans* without this breaking of the Bread, had the Substance, and thus they might mutually tolerate each other. The *Calvinists*, were not, as I remember, censured by any of theirs, and the Union succeeded effectually on their side: So that they cannot hereafter insist on the Words of Institution, Example, and express Command of our Lord. What would they say, should we give them this very Answer? But as any thing is winked at in a *Lutheran*, so nothing is allowed in a *Catholic*.

Other Objections are light, and easily answered. The Doctrine of Concomitancy, on which the *Roman Church* grounds Communion under one Kind (as you say) is a Stranger to

Aub. l. 3. p. 431, 485, 505, 539, 570. Antiquity. First, What I have produced from the Primitive Church is manifest; and if Communion under one Kind equally suppose Concomitancy with the Reality, it is clear they were believed in Primitive Times, since Communion under one Kind was then so frequently administered. Secondly, Gentlemen, turn over your Books, peruse *Aubertin* your most learned Champion: You will find almost in every Page, Passages from *St. Ambrose*, from *St. Chrysostome*, from both the *Cyrills*, and the *Cyr. Alex.* rest, where you may read, that in receiving the Sacred Body of our Lord, they received his very Person, since (say they) they received the King in their Hands: They received *Jesus Christ* and the Word of God; they received his Flesh as living; not as the Flesh of a meer Man, but as the Flesh of a God. Is not this to receive the Divinity together with the Humanity of the Son of God, and in a word, his entire Person? After this what will you call Concomitancy?

As for those Precautions for preventing the *Eucharist's* falling on the Ground, any one that is sincere and ingenuous, must confess they are as antient as the Church her self. *Aubertin* will shew you them in *Origen*; in *S. Cyrill* of *Jerusalem*; and in *S. Aub. l. II. Augustin*, not to mention any others. You will meet with such

p. 431, 432, &c.

such kind of Expressions as these, in these holy Doctors Writings, That to suffer the least Particle of the holy *Eucharist* to fall, is as it were the letting fall of precious Stones, and Gold; or the loosing of a Limb, or the slighting of the Word of God, that Seed of Life, that eternal Truth, which is preached to us.

This is enough to confound Mr. *Jurieux*. At that time, *Ex. T. VI* faith he, that is to say, in the Eleventh Age, when according *Sect. 5.* to him, *Transubstantiation* was established, they began to think of *P. 469.* the Consequences of it. When Men were persuaded the Body of our Lord was contained whole and entire under each little drop of Wine, they were immediately possessed with a Fear of its being split. If then this Fear possessed also our Forefathers from the Primitive Ages of the Church, then did they already believe *Transubstantiation* with all its Consequences. Mr. *Jurieux* goeth on: They trembled to think the adorable Body of our Lord should lie upon the Ground amongst Dust and Dirt, without a possibility of taking it up. If then our Forefathers have had the same trembling to think of it, as well as they, then according to him must they have had the same Belief. He is always mentioning this Fear of Effusion, as a necessary Consequence from the Belief of a real Presence. This Reason, faith he, that is to say, which is taken from the fear of Effusion, may be proper for them, that is to say for the Catholics; but it signifieth nothing to us who do not acknowledg, the Flesh and Blood of our Saviour are really contained under Bread and Wine. You see Gentlemen; your Ministers would fear this Effusion equally with us, did they believe also the real Presence: The Fathers then, I say again, believed it, since as it is evident they were possessed with the same Fear and Apprehension.

Mr. *Jurieux*'s Jeers on this Fear signifie little or nothing. *Ib. 469.* In an Age, faith he, when Men were not ashamed to carry upon their Faces the Character of their Sex, they dipped a great Beard into the Sacred Cup, and carried back with them a multitude of Bodies of Jesus Christ, which hung at each Hair. This produced Horror in them, and I find they had reason. He was pleased with this pretty Fancy. I am in Pain, faith he, in another *P. 415.* place, to conceive how the Faithful in the Primitive Church did not tremble to see so many Bodies hang on the Hairs of a great Beard after

after receiving the Sacred Cup. How came it they had not an Horror to see this Beard wiped with an Handkerchief, and the Body of our Lord put into the Pocket of some Seaman, or Souldier? As if God was a Respector of Persons, or as if a Seaman, or a Souldier was not as considerable in the Eyes of God as either Men. If this impertinent Buffoon had observed in the ancient Fathers, with what Decency and Respect they approached to the Holy Eucharist; if he would have observed in St. Cyrill, how the Faithful of that Age tasted the Sacred Cup, and how they were so far from suffering one Drop of it to be lost, that they with all respect applied the remaining Moisture on their Lips to their Eyes, and the other Organs of their Senses, believing them thereby Sanctified: Had he been ingenuous and candid, he would rather have extolled their Piety on such Occasion, than diverted his Party with so ridiculous a Description thereof. But let these Scoffers vent their Spleen as they please, their Railleries can prejudice the Holy Eucharist no more than those of others the Blessed Trinity, and the Incarnation of the Son of God; and the Majesty of these Mysteries is above the reach of these Discourses.

Mr. Jurieux represents us, as if we were afraid some offensive Accident should happen to the Body, and Blood of our Lord. *I do not perceive, saith he, that he is better placed on a white Cloth than in the Dust; and since we can behold him without any Horror in the Mouth and Stomach, we should not be surprized to see him on the Pavement.* In short, to speak carnally, or humanly, the Pavement is perhaps as proper a place as our Stomachs; and to speak like Believers, the Glorious State of Jesus Christ at present equally raiseth him above all: But out of Respect and Decency, we should place him, as far as lyeth in us, where he himself would be. It is Man he seeks, and he is so far from abhorring our Flesh, since he created it, since he redeemed it, since he esteems it, that he willingly approaches to sanctify it. Whatever relates to this Use honours him, since it is a Dependance on that glorious Office of the Saviour of Mankind. We do all we can, to prevent whatever may any ways derogate from the Veneration due to the Body and Blood of our Master; and without fearing any Accident may happen prejudicial to Jesus Christ, we shun the least Shadow
of

of Disrespect. But if our Precautions cannot prevent all that may happen, we know Jesus Christ, who is sufficiently guarded by his own Majesty, accepts our Zeal, and cannot be debased any where. A Man may rail, if he please, at this Doctrine: But we are so far from blushing at it, that we rather blush in behalf of those who forget their Railleries against our Precautions, reflect on the Holy Fathers, who on this Occasion were equally cautious with us. If in these latter Ages it was requisite to augment our Precautions, it was not that our Devotion to the *Holy Eucharist* is greater in these latter times than the first; but rather that Christian Piety being in a manner decayed, all Means imaginable, are requisite and to be used for its Recovery: So that these new, yet necessary Precautions, in shewing our Respects, shew also some Negligence in our Conduct.

For my part, I easily believe, what with the Order, the Silence, the Gravity of ancient Assemblies, the Blood of our Lord was seldom or never shed: These Scandals happening often in the Tumult, and Confusion of these last Ages, occasioned the People to desire, in receiving the Communion, that *Species* only they saw was least obnoxious to such Inconveniences; and so much the rather, that in receiving it alone they knew they lost nothing, possessing him whole and entire who was the sole object of their Love.

Yet I confess, when *Berengarius* rejected (in spite of the Church of his time, and the general Tradition of all the Fathers) the real Presence of Jesus Christ in this Sacrament, the Belief of this Mystery, was, as I may say, even by Opposition, quickened and enlivened, and the Piety of the Faithful, scandalized by this Heresy, was for signalizing it self by fresh Testimonies. I acknowledge here the Spirit of Holy Church, did not so vigorously or eminently adore Jesus Christ, or the Holy Ghost, till their Divinity was opposed by some new Heresy. The Mystery of the *Holy Eucharist* was to have its share, and the Heresy of *Berengarius* was as necessary for the Church, as that of *Arius*, and *Macedonius*.

As for Adoration, it will be superfluous to speak more of it, after so many Passages from the Fathers, quoted by *Auber-*

Cyr. Hi.
Cat. myst.
5. Amb. l. 3.
d. Sp. S. c.
12. Aug.
rif: Tr. in. Ps.
98.

tin, and since by Mr. de la Roque in his History of the *Eucha-*

Theod. Dia. II. Chryl. VI. de Sac. *ryst*: Is it not clear by these Passages, the *Eucharist* was adored, or rather Jesus Christ adored in the *Eucharist*, and adored by the Angels themselves, whom *St. Chrysostom* represents to us as bowing before Jesus Christ in this sacred Mystery, and rendering him the same Honours, the Emperors Guards rendered their Master.

Hist Euc. 3. p. 4. p. 541. Yet these Ministers, answer, This Adoration of the *Eucharist*, is no sovereign Adoration paid to the Divinity, but some kind of an inferior Adoration given to the sacred Symbols, or Signs.

Chryl. I. 6. de Sac. Theod. loc. cit. Sc. sup. But let them produce the like Adoration to the Water of Baptism? What can they reply to those Passages, where it is manifest the Adoration rendered here, is like that which is rendered to the King when present? Where it is clear this Adoration to the Mysteries is given them, as being in effect what they are believed to be, the Flesh of Jesus Christ, God, and Man? These Passages of the Antients signify little with them, and till our *Pretended Reformers*, have so far examined them as to be satisfied in this Point, they will at least insist on this inferior Worship, which occasioneth so many Cavils; and will urge it as altogether distinct from the supreme Worship; tho' at the same time they will allow it a religious one, since it is part of the Divine Service or Communion. Thus much of the Holy Sacraments. These kind of Answers they bring, in relation to the *Holy Eucharist*, do in a manner, blunt all the Arguments they may bring against us in relation to Relicks, Images, or the Veneration of Saints. Thus their Church and Religion, look like a ruinous piece of Building, which cannot be covered on one side, without exposing its Nakedness on the other, nor can ever yield that just Symmetry, which makes up the Beauty and Solidity of any Structure whatsoever.